

CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, December 7th, 2015, 7:00 P.M.
Frances Albrier Community Center, 2800 Park St., Berkeley, CA, 510-981-6640

AGENDA

The Commission may discuss any item listed on the agenda, but may take action only on items identified as Action.

Preliminary Matters

1. **CALL TO ORDER** (Chair)
2. **ROLL CALL** (Secretary)
3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** (Chair)
4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES** from 11-2-2015*
5. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** (Chair)
6. **PUBLIC COMMENT** (Chair)
7. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Discussion Items

8. **EARLY CHILDHOOD MENTAL HEALTH UPDATE** (Grolnic-McClurg)
9. **2020 VISION UPDATE** (Johnson)
10. **COMMUNITY AGENCIES UPDATE** (Erickson)
11. **BEST PRACTICES IN MUNICIPAL FUNDING** (Erickson)*

Action Items

12. **APPROVE THE COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2016*** (Chair)

Information Items

13. **RECENT COUNCIL REPORTS***
14. **UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS**
15. **COMMUNICATIONS**
16. **ADJOURNMENT**

An asterisk "*" indicates that written material is attached.

A double asterisk "**" indicates that written material will be provided at the meeting.

CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND RECREATION COMMISSION

MISSION STATEMENT

The Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission shall be an advisory board and shall review policies, programs, planning efforts, activities, and funding associated with recreation, youth, families, early childhood education, and other related City-sponsored activities, and shall advise the City Council on these matters.

COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mayor -	Rebecca Gebhart	District 3 -	Shoshana O'Keefe	District 6 -	Julie Sinai
District 1 -	Beth Gerstein	District 4 -	Maria Guadalupe Gallegos-Diaz	District 7 -	Gabriella Orellana
District 2 -	Moira Kenney	District 5 -	Vacant	District 8 -	Nathan Dahl

Commission Information: The Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission packet is available for review at www.cityofberkeley.info/commissions; the Berkeley Main Library and the Parks Recreation & Waterfront Department Office at 2180 Milvia Street –3rd Floor, during their normal business hours. If you have questions, call Commission Secretary, Christina Erickson at 981-6703 at 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA 94704 or by email at cerickson@cityofberkeley.info.

ADA Disclaimer: This meeting is being held in a wheelchair accessible location. To request disability-related accommodations to participate in the meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact the Disability Services specialist at 981-6342 (V) or 981-6345 (TDD) at least three business days before the meeting date. Please refrain from wearing scented products to this meeting.

SB343 Disclaimer: *Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at Parks Recreation & Waterfront Department Office at 2180 Milvia Street, Berkeley, CA.*

Communications Disclaimer: Communications to Berkeley boards, commissions or committees are public record and will become part of the City's electronic records, which are accessible through the City's website. **Please note: e-mail addresses, names, addresses, and other contact information are not required, but if included in any communication to a City board, commission or committee, will become part of the public record.** All communications to the Commission should be received at least 10 days before the meeting date. If you do not want your e-mail address or any other contact information to be made public, you may deliver communications via U.S. Postal Service or in person to the secretary of the relevant board, commission or committee. If you do not want your contact information included in the public record, please do not include that information in your communication. Please contact the secretary to the commission or committee for further information.

2015 Commission Meeting Dates

Name of Commission: Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission (CYRC)
Commission Secretary: Christina Erickson

Month	Day, Date (2015)	Time
January	2 nd Monday – January 12 th	7:00pm
January	4 th Monday – January 26 th	7:00pm
January	Special Meeting – January 31 st	8:30am
February	Special Meeting – February 7 th	8:30am
February	Special Meeting – February 9 th	5:00pm
February	4 th Monday – February 23 rd	7:00pm
March	2 nd Monday – March 9 th	7:00pm
March	4 th Monday – March 23 rd	7:00pm
April	4 th Monday – April 27 th – <i>Cancelled</i>	7:00pm
<i>May</i>	<i>* No Meeting *</i>	
June	4 th Monday – June 22 nd	7:00pm
July	Special Meeting – July 27 th	7:00pm
<i>August</i>	<i>* No Meeting *</i>	
September	4 th Monday – September 28 th	7:00pm
<i>October</i>	<i>* No Meeting *</i>	
<i>November</i>	Monday, November 2 nd	7:00pm
December	Monday, December 7 ^h	7:00pm

**CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, November 2nd, 2015, 7:00 P.M.
Frances Albrier Community Center, 2800 Park St., Berkeley, CA, 510-981-6640**

DRAFT MINUTES

The Commission may discuss any item listed on the agenda, but may take action only on items identified as Action.

Preliminary Matters

1. **CALL TO ORDER** (Chair): 7:05pm.
2. **ROLL CALL** (Secretary): Present: Dahl; Gebhart; Gerstein; O'Keefe; Sinai. Absent: Gallegos-Diaz; Kenney; Orellana.
3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** (Chair)
4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES** from 09-28-2015*: M/S (Gerstein/Sinai): Aye's: Dahl; Gebhart; Gerstein; Sinai. No's: None. Abstain: O'Keefe.
5. **APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** (Chair)
6. **PUBLIC COMMENT** (Chair)
7. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT***

Discussion Items

8. **2020 VISION UPDATE** (Johnson)
9. **BEST PRACTICES IN MUNICIPAL FUNDING** (Erickson)*
10. **CAMPS UPDATE** (Ferris/Brown)*
11. **SUMMER LUNCH PROGRAM** (Brown)*
12. **PARKS & WATERFRONT COMMISSION PROJECT** (Chair)**

Action Items

Information Items

13. **RESILIENT BERKELEY WORKSHOP***
14. **RECENT COUNCIL REPORTS***
15. **UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS:** QRIS Update
16. **COMMUNICATIONS**
17. **ADJOURNMENT:** 8:30pm.

An asterisk "*" indicates that written material is attached.

A double asterisk "**" indicates that written material will be provided at the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 7

**Parks Recreation and Waterfront
FY 2016 Directors Report**

2020 Vision & Beyond (Johnson)

- **2020 Workgroups:** All five workgroups are developing new work plans that will be presented to the Leadership Team.
- **College and Career Summit:** Planning committee has met and begun planning the summit.
- A **sustainability team** will be meeting next week to discuss sustainability recommendations for the 2020 Vision that will be presented to Leadership Team in January, along with the work plans for each indicator.

AGENDA ITEM 11

Best Practices in Municipal Funding

A Summary of Regional and National Policies and Practices for City Funding of Children and Youth Serving Programs

Prepared for the City of Berkeley

August 2015

Gibson & Associates

Nada Djordjevich, Ed.M.

Julie Johnson, M.Ed.

Christine Travis-Smith, BS.

Paul Gibson, MA

General Framework

This report focused on how municipalities disperse funds, primarily, to nonprofit agencies that serve early childhood, children, and youth. Our purpose in this examination was to understand consensus best practices, regional approaches, and the work of like-cities with similar resources and goals in funding to that of the City of Berkeley. Research included regional, state, and national models, reviews of best practice studies, and federal guidelines for municipal funds. Our research on best practices included both a 2013 and a 2009 study that each reviewed nonprofit funding policies of municipalities. Both of these studies had included the City of Berkeley in their research.

As part of our national review, we examined the City of Portland's allocation of the Children's Levy funds. This voter-sponsored tax program, supports low-income children from birth to age 24 and has provided extensive documentation of their process, policies, and outcomes. It should be noted that cities and counties may allocate up to 15% of their Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding to agency services for programs serving low-income children and youth. Therefore we also looked at research on CDBG service funding and protocols as well as allocation of mitigation, general, parcel tax and other city funds.

Locally, this report incorporates research and document analysis of local programs and key informant interviews. We conducted interviews with city staff in Oakland (Oakland Fund for Children and Youth), San Francisco (Department of Children Youth and Families), and Palo Alto (City General Funds). The interview protocol and summary responses are included in the Appendix. We recognize that these cities differ in resources, but there are commonalities of approach, and many City funded regional nonprofits receive resources from two or more cities in the region, including the City of Berkeley.

Key Resources and Appendices with links to several documents, along with interviews information are provided at the end of this report. This report is intended for the review by City Staff and Commissioners only. If wider distribution of this report is sought, please contact Nada Djordjevich at Gibson & Associates.

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

I. Overall Findings on Municipal Funding Policies

The summary below identifies common and best practices in municipal strategies to fund nonprofit agencies, with an emphasis on processes for funding early childhood, children, and youth programs.

Request for Proposals (RFP)

- Agencies are usually funded for two to five years, with renewal of funding contingent upon agency's year one performance and annual amounts varying according to city budget.
- Applications focus on local outcome priorities identified by a needs assessment. The RFP structure may vary from a request for agency fulfillment of prescriptive targeted investment strategies, to a broad request for nonprofit services to address the city's identified priorities.
- Most applications have minimum funding thresholds, and some require some type of match to demonstrate community investment in agency and program sustainability. Often the first year of match funding, of a three or four year grant, may not be required.
- The scoring rubric is often included in the RFP. Post-award notification, cities will provide summary information on cut-off and average scores, and share applicant scores by request.

Application Review

- The review period appears to be three months. Reviews may involve an intent to apply and/or review of fiscal/operational prior to final review. New and prior agencies may have separate application procedures.
- Reviewers are city staff and volunteer or stipended community members. Reviewers receive training in the application protocol and may have expertise in RFP content or strategy areas.
- Commissions and officials engage in the assessment and prioritizing of funding strategies. There is a movement away from elected official involvement in application reviews.
- Most cities have systems to prevent potential conflict of interest or undue influence by agencies. These include handbooks, certifications by reviewers and applicants, and restrictions on contact with local officials, staff, or reviewers during the review period.

Monitoring & Evaluation

- Programs appear to include 5% to 15% of their budget toward evaluation and monitoring.
- Monitoring focuses on budgets, fiscal operations, and units of service provided. Monitoring schedules and systems vary, and required program reports vary from simple to very complex.
- Annual evaluations often include an agency self-review, client surveys, and outcome data. External evaluations often include a site visit, document review, and outcome analysis.
- Outcome measures are often the same across agencies, and designed to address city goals.
- Agency evaluation and progress monitoring reports are considered in future applications.

Technical Assistance (TA)

- Cities often include general nonprofit seminars (board development, logic model/theory of actions, measurable outcomes), along with strategy specific TA sessions related to city goals.
- In some cases, all agencies may receive 1:1 TA, and in others 1:1 TA is provided for new agencies, those requesting support, and/or those in specialized areas in need of support.
- Tiered TA support may be triggered by not meeting application goals or monitoring requirements. This support may include the development of corrective actions.
- TA and evaluation support is provided through consultants, city staff and other partners.

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

II. Area Findings: Request for Proposals (RFP)

A. Funding Cycles and Timeline for All Agencies

The funding cycle for most grants are usually for two to four years, with funding after the initial year pending performance and city budgets. Oakland's Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY) has a three-year cycle; San Francisco's Department of Children Youth and Families (DCYF) is a three-year grant moving toward a five-year cycle, the City of Palo Alto general funds provide agencies with two years of funding, and the Portland's Children Levy supports grants with two to four years.

City of Berkeley: The City currently has a two-year funding cycle.

- ❖ **Recommendations:** *The City should review a longer year cycle to minimize staff and agency application burden and promote agency program sustainability.*

B. Needs Assessments and Targeted Investment Strategies versus Broad Outcomes

A needs assessment is often conducted prior to the development and release of the RFP, generally every three to five years. Commissions and/or committees engaged include elected officials, experts, community members, and youth. The assessment will identify outcomes and strategies, and may often include city blocks and/or demographic groups most in need of city services. Based on the needs assessment, cities apply either a Targeted Investment Strategy or Broad Outcome Approach. A **Targeted Investment Strategy** provides a prescriptive funding program, and allows for alignment of program models, measures, and outcomes. San Francisco's DCYF uses a Targeted Investment Strategy model that includes geographic areas, program operation hours, and types of programming. The **Broad Outcome Approach** asks nonprofit to design their own strategies to meet city's goals. San Diego's CDBG uses this approach. The advantage of a BOA is that it can align to the services that nonprofits already provide, but projects may be difficult to monitor and evaluate.

City of Berkeley: The City's RFP identified targeted investment strategies in each area. The City's most targeted approach was identified for Early Childhood Programs and Services.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City should consider prescriptive targeted investment strategies to meet 2020 Vision outcomes not currently being adequately addressed by nonprofit partner agencies.*

C. Funding Thresholds and Matches

Many cities have minimum application funding threshold amounts in order that the applicant review, monitoring, and evaluation, outweighs the grant. Some cities request agencies to find private, foundation, or other public funds to match municipal resources, demonstrating fiscal diversification and sustainability. Often, in the first year of funding, the match may not be required.

City of Berkeley: While diversification of resources is encouraged, there is no requirement.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *Create a funding threshold (~\$20,000) that recognizes the amount of staff time required to fiscally manage, monitor, and evaluate agency activities. If the city creates a longer-funding cycle period (three to four years), require agencies to develop plans for matched resources.*

D. RFP Application Scoring Systems

Many cities post their scoring system in the application. Applications will have three independent reviewers and scores averaged by city staff. City staff may be involved if there are significant score discrepancies. Post-award notification, cities provide information and applicant scores by request.

City of Berkeley: The City has a scoring system but lacks transparency in usage.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City's scoring rubric should be included in the next application. Cut off funding scores, average scores, and applicant's scores as requested should be made available.*

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

III. Area Findings: Application Review

A. Review Period and Funding

The review period appears to be three months. Reviews may involve an intent to apply and/or review of fiscal/operational prior to application. In some cases, applications are different for past-funded agencies and may be simpler. For some city processes, new agency applicants may undergo a site visit, initial interview, or other technical assistance to level the field between new and veteran agencies.

City of Berkeley: The City's review schedule is in alignment with others. The City's process for new and prior applicants may result in favoring prior applicants, more familiar with the system.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The city should consider a group Technical Assistance (TA) session for new agencies prior to RFP release on the RFP process signaling the openness of the application process.*

B. Reviewers

Generally reviewers are a combination of city staff, and community members who are volunteers or receive a small stipend. For example, reviewers from the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth, receive small stipends, have expertise in the content areas and receive training in review protocol. The City of Portland recently analyzed its review process and noted that using a stipend approach, rather than a completely volunteer basis may result in better application reviews.

City of Berkeley: The City's reviewers include volunteer Commission members and City staff.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City should consider developing Community Review policies.*

C. City commissions and elected officials engage in prioritizing of funding and overall strategies.

In most cases, the City Council makes final recommendations after a subcommittee or commission analyzes reviewer scores. The roles of elected bodies and commissions are generally to ensure alignment of funding strategies to the city's priorities. For example, they might decide the portion of funds to be allocated toward general areas (early childhood, out of school time) and specify the types of targeted investment strategies for agencies. There has been a deliberate movement away from elected official involvement in individual application reviews.

City of Berkeley: The City Council reviews staff and commission recommendations, but also reviews information provided to Council by applicants during public events.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may want to consider community review policy, and focus Council and Commissioners' attention on strategy and fund alignment rather than individual applicant review.*

D. Conflicts of Interest and Applicant/Reviewer Handbooks

Most cities have systems to prevent potential conflict of interest or undue influence. These include handbooks, certifications by reviewers and applicants, and restrictions on contact with local officials, staff, or community reviewers during the application period. For example, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) handbook used in San Diego, includes details about what would constitute a conflict of interest, information on how to score applicants, and how to react to reviewer background or historical knowledge of applicant. Applicants may also sign certifications of participation at technical assistance sessions, noting their understanding of criteria and rules. Some guidelines include removal of agency applicants, if they do not follow application rules, including contacting reviewers or city officials to discuss their application outside of the official procedures.

City of Berkeley: The City does not currently have a policy handbook for reviewer or applicants.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may want to develop a handbook for reviewers and certifications of applicants, based on models used in other cities.*

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

IV. Area Findings: Monitoring & Evaluation

A. Programs appear to include 5% to 15% of their budget toward evaluation and monitoring.

While cities describe an administrative cost of 10% for such programs, most do not formally track in-kind staffing. For example, while OFCY describes 10% of the fund allocated to the following administration – applicant reviewing, monitoring, and external evaluation, there are other staff costs that are not formally documented. The City of Portland’s Children’s Levy, a voter-supported property tax program, underwent a formal external audit that identified a 5% cost for administration and evaluation. It should be noted a longer-funding cycle for grantees and use of targeted investment strategies, result in lowered staff administrative costs and increased evaluation efficiency.

City of Berkeley: The City does not have an explicit budget allocation of administrative costs.

B. Monitoring focuses on budgets, fiscal operations, and units of service provided.

Monitoring schedules and systems vary, and required program progress reports vary. Most cities hold TA sessions, and have posted online resources to assist agencies in their monitoring self-review. Fiscal accountability systems are quite similar, but systems for calculating units of service are more varied. Some cities make transparent the cost per service unit, per agency, and as compared to other agencies providing similar service; noting how costs may vary by type (attendance, participation, treatment) and the long-term value of the service.

City of Berkeley: The City asks all grantees to monitor budgets, fiscal operations and service.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City should continue to monitor grantees, and may want to provide online resources for grantees to support their completion of the progress monitoring reports.*

C. Agency evaluations most often include self-review, external review, and outcome data analyses.

Cities use a combination of city staff and consultants to support agency evaluations that combine qualitative and quantitative measures (observation, interview, outcome data). Evaluation results are shared with agencies and overall findings with comparative scores of agencies are often made public.

City of Berkeley: In 2014, the City used an evaluation process aligned to other city’s practices.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may wish to consider use of a once-per funding period cycle of evaluation, complemented by annual self-evaluations, and progress monitoring reports.*

D. Outcome measures are often the same across agencies, and designed to address city goals.

Cities often ask agencies to use the same measures. This enables the cities to both compare and aggregate results of agencies, and track progress on city goals. An example of shared outcomes may be that all agencies that focus on student engagement, report student attendance and GPA scores.

City of Berkeley: The City asks agencies to report on common outcomes using city-defined tools.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may want to consider use of a few common areas related to 2020 Vision and aggregate results of all funded agencies, to determine impact on outcomes.*

E. Agency monitoring and evaluation data is often included in future applicant cycles.

Most city applications include a score for past agency performance. In San Francisco funded agencies that did not meet monitoring requirements (after two years of technical assistance), and in Oakland, OFCY funded agencies with low evaluation scores, are ineligible to apply for the next application cycle.

City of Berkeley: The City does have application questions aligned to agency’s monitoring reports.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may want to include information in applications and agency contracts that describe how past performance may influence applicant future funding eligibility.*

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

V. Area Findings: Technical Assistance (TA)

A. Cities often include general nonprofit seminars (board development, logic model/theory of actions, measurable outcomes), along with strategy specific TA sessions related to city goals.

Most cities offer annual professional learning sessions that offer all agencies the opportunity to strengthen their programs, and to support a common language for agencies. In addition, cities offer sessions tailored to their content area and need, often put on by partners such as the school district, or county health, or other public agencies. These are designed to support strategic alignment and build collaborative energy among city agencies as partners in a collective endeavor.

City of Berkeley: The City provided general technical assistance, and seminars in each funding area.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City should continue to support agency development and strategic alignment of resources through technical assistance and area collaborative meetings.*

B. In some cases, all agencies may receive 1:1 TA, and in others 1:1 TA is provided for newly funded agencies, agencies who request support, and/or those in specialized areas in need of support.

The types of technical assistance available may include contract-development, and onsite support to understand how to complete monitoring and fiscal reports. With new strategic areas of funding, group technical assistance and/or 1:1 follow-up agency assistance may be provided.

City of Berkeley: The City provides some technical assistance but levels vary.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may want to continue to provide agencies with 1:1 or group technical assistance in monitoring units of service and measuring outcomes.*

C. If an agency's monitoring report and/or evaluation indicate need for improvements, technical assistance, corrective actions, or contract modification systems may be triggered.

Most cities have systems to use monitoring and evaluation data to provide technical assistance, contract modification, or corrective actions and timelines for improvements for agencies failing to meet requirements. San Francisco has a tiered system for agency monitoring of all city-funded agencies through the Office of the Controller. Agency monitoring findings (primarily fiscal and operational in nature) are made public. An agency with an “elevated concern” status will receive TA support to implement corrective actions. It will receive a “red flag” status if, after receiving TA support, they are not able to fully implement corrective actions in a timely manner.

City of Berkeley: The City provides support to agencies based on project monitoring reports.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City may consider identifying a tiered system of support that allows agencies to receive support to make timely corrections, and supports efficient use of city funds.*

D. TA and evaluation support is provided through a combination of consultants, city staff and partners.

Cities appear to use a combination of city staff and consultants to support annual evaluations of agencies, and technical assistance seminars and meetings. Cities often also partner with school districts, nonprofits such as First Five, and other governmental entities to streamline technical assistance and improve cohesion and collaboration and alignment of resources. The City of San Francisco also encourages agencies to work with external coaches and consultants to develop internal capacity to meeting monitoring goals and reporting requirements.

City of Berkeley: In 2014, the City used a combination of consultants, city staff, and other partners (such as the Berkeley Unified School District) to provide technical assistance and evaluation support.

- ❖ **Recommendation:** *The City should continue to identify systems of technical assistance and evaluation support that promote cohesion and alignment of resources.*

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

Appendix I: Key Resource Links and Reference Information

A Study of Municipal Funding of Nonprofit Agencies For The City of College Station, Texas

This 2009 study conducted by researchers at Texas A&M University examined municipal funding policies of 10 Texas cities, and 34 nationwide (including Berkeley, California).

<http://bush.tamu.edu/research/capstones/mpsa/projects/2009/MunicipalFundingOfNonprofits.pdf>

City and County of San Francisco's Department of Children, Youth and their Families

The website includes RFPs with scoring guides, evaluation and monitoring rubrics, specialized information for content areas (out of school time, early childhood), and general nonprofit resources.

<http://dcyf.org>

City and County of San Francisco's Office of the Controller

The Citywide Nonprofit Monitoring and Capacity Building Program provides information on the nonprofit monitoring and technical assistance system used by the city and county of San Francisco.

<http://sfcontroller.org/index.aspx?page=788>

City of Portland's Children's Levy

A voter-sponsored initiative that provides resources to Early Childhood Services and Education, Foster Care, Hunger Relief, After School Program, Mentoring, and Child Abuse and Prevention.

<http://portlandchildrenslevy.org>

Comparative City Survey of Funding Allocation Policies for Nonprofit Services

This 2013 white paper examined mitigation fund strategies. The study examined policies of eight United States cities (including Berkeley, California), and that of Vancouver, British Columbia.

<http://www2.cambridgema.gov>

Oakland Fund for Children and Youth

The website includes the RFP, contract documents, strategic plan, and evaluation reports.

<http://www.ofcy.org/>

Two Models for Nonprofit Funding Allocation: Lessons for Nonprofit Managers

This research study provides an overview of methods and legality of city nonprofit funding.

http://supportcenteronline.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/SCNM_JOURNAL_2010_6.pdf

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

Appendix II: Sample Tools and Additional Resources

City and County of San Francisco's Department of Children, Youth and their Families

Children's Service Allocation Plan

This document provides detailed information on allocation of funding in San Francisco.

<http://www.dcyf.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=12>

SF DCYF Decision Process 2013.16

This 4-page memorandum provides staff recalibrated information on the allocation of 2013-16 funding protocol, including how agencies were scored and staff calibration of scores.

<http://www.dcyf.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=689>

San Francisco Expanded Learning Collaborative Afterschool Quality Self-Assessment

This document is an example of the self-review for DCYF funded Out of School Time agencies.

<http://sfelc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/QSA-Afterschool-Writeable.pdf>

City of Portland – Portland's Children Levy

http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/grantees/forms/rfi_archives

This lists past application information and funding guidelines.

Early Childhood Request for Investment.FINAL

This provides details on funding programs and scoring for their application.

Exhibit H.Scoring Form for Early Childhood Applications

This document provides scoring information on ECE application.

Oakland Fund for Children and Youth

OFCY – Strategic Investment Policy

<http://www.ofcy.org/assets/Uploads/Strategic-Plan/OFCY-Strategic-Plan-FULL-VERSION.pdf>

This is the OFCY needs assessment that serves as the basis for OFCY funding allocation.

OFCY Grant Renewal Policy – FY2013-2016

<http://www.ofcy.org/assets/Grantee-Corner/OFCY-Grant-Renewal-Policy-FY2015-2016.pdf>

This memorandum outlines standards for agency performance, and requirements for agencies to be continued to be funded in Years Two and Three of their Three Year cycle.

City of San Diego

Community Development Block Grant Program Applications Review Panel Handbook

<http://www.sandiego.gov/cdbg/pdf/2014/fy2015cpabreviewhandbook.pdf>

This handbook provides information on procedures for reviewing CDBG applications, includes conflict of interest policies, code of ethics, and certifications by reviewers.

2016 CDBG Scores and Ranking

<http://www.sandiego.gov/cdbg/pdf/2015/fy16cdbgcpabappscorerankncip.pdf>

This document is an example of how scores and ranking of applications can be presented.

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

Appendix III: Key Informant Interview Protocol and Results

Date: _____
Contact Name: _____
Contact Title: _____
City: _____
Forward Best Practice Guide to: _____

Hello. My name is XXXXX and I work for Gibson & Associates. We are working with the City of Berkeley and organizing resources into Best and Common Practices for municipal funding with a focus on agency funding for nonprofits for Early Childhood, Children, and Youth. We are querying local cities regarding their practices and hope you can answer the following questions. Once it's completed, we would be a happy to share our list of resources with your city. It will include a list of resources and best practices, example RFPs, and scoring sheets.

- 1. *What is the timeline for funding proposal release, review, and final award notification?***

- 2. *How does the contract term for the budgets align with the budget cycle of your municipality?***

- 3. *Who is involved in your funding review process? (Example: community members, staff, volunteer commissions, elected officials).***

- 4. *What percent of the budget is allocated toward proposal review, toward monitoring, and toward evaluation? Are outside consultants used in this process?***
Proposal Review: _____
Monitoring: _____
Evaluation: _____
Outside Consultants: Yes No

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

Date: 8/3/15

Contact Title: Program Planner

City: Oakland

1. What is the timeline for funding proposal release, review, and final award notification?

- 3 year grant cycle (current cycle is coming up, they are evaluating the prior timeline for possible adjustment)
- Year 1, Year 2 & 3 renewal is contingent on program results. Mid-year evaluation after 6 months by an external evaluator, followed by information gathered on the 3rd quarter by OFCY staff. Recommendations presented by staff to POC in March/April. POC recommendations presented to City Council in May or June for approval of year 2 or 3 funds.
- Last grant cycle: RFP released in December, RFP due date 6-7 weeks later – end of January, review begun February by external reviewers (60 professional reviewers with relevant expertise paid a stipend, reviewers cannot have conflict of interest) as well as OFCY staff, once 3 independent reviews are received, staff computes an average score, then ranks proposals by strategy, staff also considers council district representation, volume of youth served, if service is being rendered to a specific “priority” population, what leverage funds the organization has. Rankings and staff recommendations are generally presented to the Planning Oversight Subcommittee in March/April, leaving time for an appeals process. POS recommendations are presented to the full Planning Oversight Committee in late April/early May for approval. Once approved, recommendations are presented to the City Council for an up or down vote.
- Last grant cycle they had developed 11 strategy areas and they received 250 proposals, lots to sort through. As such, they are considering sending out the RFP in November for this cycle but that has yet to be determined

2. How does the contract term for the budgets align with the budget cycle of your municipality?

- July 1 – June 30 for grant that coincides with the city’s fiscal year.
- See notes above for year 2 and 3 cycles

3. Who is involved in your funding review process? (Example: community members, staff, volunteer commissions, elected officials).

- COO utilizes 60 external reviewers with expertise in the areas they are trying to serve (members from the county, First 5, etc). They must not have a conflict of interest. They are paid a very small stipend.
- OFCY Staff Review – Performs a basic review to ensure that all required elements are required in the bid, averages 3 independent reviewers scores, summarizes bids by strategy, also looks at the district, number of people served, cost per service, serving “specific priority” population, what leverage funds the agency has, presents recommendation to POC.

Gibson & Associates Summary Research of Best Practices

- Planning Oversight Subcommittee – reviews average ranking and staff recommendations, also hears appeals, sends results to POC
- Planning Oversight Committee – finalizes recommendations and sends them to the City Council
- City Council – up or down vote

Note: The Planning and Oversight Committee is comprised of 17 Oakland residents, 8 of which are youth not older than 21 years of age. Each City Council member appoints one adult and one youth to the POC, and the Office of the Mayor appoints one adult. The Planning and Oversight Committee meets as a full committee on the first and/or third Wednesday of the month, unless otherwise scheduled. Subcommittees include 1) Evaluation, 2) Review, 3) Strategic Planning, and 4) RFP development 5) Appeals. Subcommittee meeting schedules vary depending on the cycle of POC activities. All meetings are open to the public. Sign up here to receive regular announcements for upcoming POC and subcommittee meetings.

4. *What percent of the budget is allocated toward proposal review, toward monitoring, and toward evaluation? Are outside consultants used in this process?*

Proposal Review & Monitoring: 80% of the 10% (see Note below)
Evaluation: 20% of the 10 % (see Note below)
Outside Consultants: Yes No (used for evaluation)

Note: OFCY uses 90% of funds for grants for direct services for Oakland children and youth, and 10% for administration including staffing, evaluation, grant management and strategic planning.

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

Date: 8/5/15

Contact Title: Grants Manager

City: San Francisco

1. What is the timeline for funding proposal release, review, and final award notification?

Note: Operations are in the process of transitioning from a 3-year to a 5-year cycle.

Prior Cycle:

Year 1: Community Needs Assessment performed - Sources of information included census and population survey data, City administrative databases, neighborhood meetings attended by 743 residents, a survey of 145 community-based organizations, conversations with 20 policy and advisory bodies, focus groups involving more than 80 parents and providers, and interviews with key City leaders. All told, DCYF's commitment to broad community engagement resulted in the participation of more than 1,000 individuals in this Needs Assessment.

Year 2: Children's Services Allocation Plan developed – lays out DCYF's strategy for the 3 year grant cycle

Year 3: Request for Proposal, Review, Award granted for 3 years

Note: the most recent cycle is for the period from 2013-2016. Grant recipients will have their grants extended for two more years unless monitoring efforts uncover problems that cannot be resolved.

Manager did not know the exact time frame as he was not there the last cycle but he thought it was:

- RFP sent out in December/January
- Due date 4-6 weeks
- Bids sorted by strategy and forwarded to Review Panels for a particular strategy. Panels are comprised of DCYF staff and other City staff with relevant experience for a given strategy.
- Extensive review is performed: bids scored by Review Panels, recommendations forwarded to the Advisory Committee who can make suggestions/modifications. Once recommendations are finalized, information is sent to the DFYC's Grant Contract Department who prepares a work plan. The work plan specifies the grant funds awarded, budget allocation, and performance measures. The work plan is submitted as part of the formal City of SF contract. Review and final contract finalized prior to start of fiscal year on 7/1 (typically in June).

Tentative New Cycle:

Year 1: Community Needs Assessment (CNA) performed (2015)

Year 2: Children's Services Allocation Plan (CSAP) developed (2016)

Year 3: Request for Proposal, Review, Award granted for 5 years (2017)

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

The manager anticipates the cycle will look like the prior cycle but changes may be made as they get closer to sending out the RFP.

Note: External consultants are often engaged to assist in the preparation of the CNA and the CSAP and may be engaged to track the review process but they do not participate in the review process.

2. How does the contract term for the budgets align with the budget cycle of your municipality?

- July 1 – June 30 for grant that coincides with the City’s fiscal year.

3. Who is involved in your funding review process? (Example: community members, staff, volunteer commissions, elected officials).

As noted above, a comprehensive Community Needs Assessment (CAN) is completed with input from community members, CBOs, key City leaders to name a few. The CNA is used by DCYF staff to develop a Children’s Services Allocation Plan, which guides DCYF’s strategy over the 5-year award period. Bids received are sorted by strategy and reviewed by Panels made up of DCYF and City staff that has relevant expertise with respect to the strategy being addressed.

4. What percent of the budget is allocated toward proposal review, toward monitoring, and toward evaluation? Are outside consultants used in this process?

Proposal Review:

Monitoring:

Evaluation:

Outside Consultants: Yes No

DCYF does not track this break-out at the current time.

Outside consultants are not used for reviewing the bids received but may be engaged to assist in the preparation of the Community Needs Assessments or used to manage the review process. Evaluations are performed by DCYF staff. Program specialists/analysts perform periodic site visits. A fiscal review is performed, including looking at budgets, audits, and invoices submitted. Depending on the size of the grant awarded, an external audit may be required of the agency receiving grant funds.

Note: the City and County of San Francisco also awards grants to agencies through First Five and the Office of Early Care & Education. Differences in the grant award process exist. However, when grants are awarded by more than one department, reviews of the agency are coordinated so as to efficiently use City resources to monitor compliance with the terms of the various grants.

Gibson & Associates
Summary Research of Best Practices

Date: 8/10/15

Contact Title: Manager, Office of Human Services

City: Palo Alto

1. What is the timeline for funding proposal release, review, and final award notification?

- RFP sent out in late November
- Bids due mid-January
- The manager & a co-worker perform an initial review to determine if the bid meets the eligibility requirements & bid is complete, rubric is completed
- Eligible bids are forwarded to a subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission (HRC)
- Recommendations are sent to the full HRC for approval/input in March
- Recommendations are sent to the Finance Committee in April and are incorporated into the budget of the Office of Human Services
- Final budget (including funding awards) are sent to the Full City Council in May for approval
- Award notifications are sent out in June

2. How does the contract term for the budgets align with the budget cycle of your municipality?

- Awards are granted to agencies on a bi-annual basis, though funding levels may vary year-to-year as the budget changes
- The funding level is set every spring once the current year budget is determined
- The contract term is aligned to the City budget cycle: July 1- June 30

3. Who is involved in your funding review process? (Example: community members, staff, volunteer commissions, elected officials).

• **Background:**

Since 1983, the HSRAP Process (Human Services Resource Allocation Process) has identified community service needs to determine City funding for human services (CMR:147:83). The City's Human Relations Commission (HRC) participated in identifying human services needs through information provided by the community at the HRC's monthly meetings and findings from the extensive research it conducted for the Human Services Needs Assessment report completed in 2012 and a supplemental need assessment conducted in 2014.

These needs assessment activities assisted in establishing bi-annual priorities of human services needs for the Palo Alto community. The HSRAP Allocations Sub-Committee (Allocations Committee),

Gibson & Associates Summary Research of Best Practices

comprised of Human Services staff and three HRC Commissioners, reviewed and analyzed the merits of funding requests and provided funding recommendations based on the established funding criteria and the bi-annual priority of needs. The Allocations Committee's recommendations are reviewed by the HRC and then forwarded to Council through the Finance Committee for consideration and approval.

- Bids received each year are initially reviewed by two members of the Office of Human Service who check them to see if they are complete; a preliminary rubric is completed
- Complete bids are forwarded to a Subcommittee of the Human Relations Commission (HRC)
- The HRC is comprised of seven members who are not Council Members, officers, or employees of the City, and who are residents of the City of Palo Alto. Terms are for three years and commence on May 1. The HRC conducts regular monthly meetings at 7:00 on the second Thursday of each month.
- The Subcommittee reviews and scores the bids and prepares funding recommendations that are presented to the full HRC for approval. The recommendations also include alternative funding levels should additional fund become available.
- The full HRC reviews the recommendations, hears comments from the public, and approves the final recommendations.
- Note: funding levels recommended are incorporated into the annual budget of the Office of Human Services, which is approved by the Finance Committee.
- Approved recommendations are forwarded to the Finance Committee (made up of 4 members of the City Council) for approval and forwarding to the full Council for final approval.

4. What percent of the budget is allocated toward proposal review, toward monitoring, and toward evaluation? Are outside consultants used in this process?

Proposal Review:

Monitoring:

Evaluation:

Outside Consultants: Yes No

Percent of budget by area was not available.

Beyond the proposal review and approval process, agencies are required to submit quarterly reports that are reviewed by staff from the Office of Human Services (2 staff members). Note: funds are dispersed to the agencies based upon the quarterly reports they submit. These reports included both quantitative and qualitative data that allow them to determine whether service level goals are being met and contract terms are being adhered to. In addition, members of the HRC visit each grantee agency at least once during the 2-year award cycle.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Proposed 2016 Commission Meeting Dates

Name of Commission: Children, Youth, and Recreation Commission (CYRC)
Commission Secretary: Christina Erickson

Month	Day, Date (2015)	Time
January	4 th Monday – January 25 th	7:00pm
February	4 th Monday – February 22 nd	7:00pm
March	4 th Monday – March 28 th	7:00pm
April	4 th Monday – April 25 th	7:00pm
May	4 th Monday – May 23 rd	7:00pm
June	4 th Monday – June 27 th	7:00pm
<i>July</i>	<i>* No Meeting *</i>	
August	4 th Monday – August 22 nd	7:00pm
September	4 th Monday – September 26 th	7:00pm
October	4 th Monday – October 24 th	7:00pm
November	4 th Monday – November 28 th	7:00pm
<i>December</i>	<i>* No Meeting *</i>	

AGENDA ITEM 12

RECENT COUNCIL REPORTS

The following recent council reports are available for review at the Parks Recreation & Waterfront Department administrative desk, 2180 Milvia Street, 3rd floor, or can be accessed from the City Council Website by using the following URL's:

December 1, 2015 – Consent – Lease Agreement: Hana Japan Restaurant at 235 University Avenue. URL: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2015/12_Dec/Documents/2015-12-01_Item_07_Lease_Agreement_Hana.aspx

December 1, 2015 – Consent – Contract: Integra Construction Services Inc. for Grove Park Tennis and Basketball Courts Renovation. URL: http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2015/12_Dec/Documents/2015-12-01_Item_08_Contract_Integra_Construction.aspx

December 1, 2015 – Information –
http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2015/12_Dec/Documents/2015-12-01_Item_36_Audit_Implementation.aspx. URL:
http://www.cityofberkeley.info/Clerk/City_Council/2015/12_Dec/Documents/2015-12-01_Item_36_Audit_Implementation.aspx