

D. Rationale for Distribution of Funds

The following section outlines the recommendations from the Children and Youth Commission related to the rationale for distributing CYC Funds. The Commission recommends the following starting in the 2018-2020 funding cycle:

- Equal distribution of the 3% GRT allocation among the four priority funding categories
- Alignment of funds to the current CYC outcomes and indicators as outlined in the Ends Framework
- Creation of an Innovation Fund to support special projects at lower funding level, with streamlined application and reporting requirements
- Priority given to programs or projects that address equity by serving those who are underrepresented and/or have historically struggled to access services and opportunities or address a service gap, and to programs or projects that collaborate with other non-profit organizations

Equal Distribution Among Priority Areas

The Children and Youth Commission members discussed various options for determining the distribution of funds to the priority categories identified in the Ends Framework at the Strategic Planning Retreat. Commission members recommend that the 3% GRT allocation be distributed equally to the four priority areas with an addition of a smaller fund category for innovation funds for priority projects that arise throughout the two-year funding cycle. Commission members also decided that there should be flexibility to shift funds to another category if there are not adequate high-scoring applications in one of the other priority areas.

Innovation Fund

Commission members recommend the development of a new Innovation Fund to support special projects that promote healthy child and youth development and resiliency but may not meet all requirements for CYC funding in priority funding categories. Organizations could apply for smaller grants of either \$2,500 or \$5,000 to support innovation through a separate and streamlined RFP with fewer application and reporting requirements, allowing them to maximize the use of funds toward program innovation. The Innovation Fund would have a priority deadline but could remain open throughout the two-year cycle to allow CYC to respond to emerging opportunities throughout the year.

Priority to Projects Addressing Disparities and Gaps

Commission members also recommend priority be given to projects that address equity by serving those who are underrepresented and/or have historically struggled to access services and opportunities. For example, data show that a growing number of Santa Feans have obtained health insurance over recent years (CHRISTUS St. Vincent Community Health Needs Assessment, 2017). However, there is evidence that some sub-groups and neighborhoods continue to have a high number of uninsured children, youth and families. Organizations that seek to address this inequitable access to opportunity and services would be prioritized for funding in order to direct resources to areas of greatest need.

Another example of funding prioritization might be to organizations that demonstrate quality programs and results and increase “Out of School Time (OST)” opportunities for children and youth from high-poverty neighborhoods and schools.

Alignment of funds to CYC Outcomes and Indicators as outlined in the Ends Framework

The chart below shows how the equal distribution of funds and an Innovation Fund compares to past funding.

Objective: Align distribution of funds to critical priorities identified by CYC in addition to a smaller fund category for innovation funds for priority projects that arise throughout the two-year funding cycle.

Critical Priority - Funding Category	Current Funding Distribution (2016-2018)		Proposed Funding Distribution (2019-2021)		Notes
Early Care and Education for Children 0-5	\$92,000	9%	\$239,000	23.75%	Increased funding
Supplemental Education for School-Age Children	\$539,400	53%	\$239,000	23.75%	Decreased funding
Youth Wellness	\$127,000	13%	\$239,000	23.75%	Increased funding
Reconnecting Youth	\$256,000	25%	\$239,000	23.75%	Funding level stable
Innovation Funding for special projects			\$60,000	5%	Small grants of either \$2,500 or \$5,000; separate and streamlined RFP with priority and open deadline; fewer reporting requirements
Special Project Consultants	\$64,000		\$64,000		CYC Data Project
CYC Manager Salary + Benefits	\$120,000		\$120,000		
TOTAL FUNDS			\$1,200,000		

Estimated \$1,016,000 available for CYC grant funding contingent upon GRT

If funding is not spent from the respective priority area, the funding will then be applied to other priority areas as needed.

E. Rationale for Funding Decisions

Funding Decisions Based on Performance Results

The Children and Youth Commission members recommend that funding be awarded to grantees that demonstrate excellence on the CYC funding criteria. The criteria includes the following:

- Alignment with the City Children and Youth Commission priority outcomes and indicators as outlined in the Ends Framework and RFP
- Demonstration of a plan to address disparities, gaps and report on results
- Demonstration of performance accountability for services they provide (e.g. data on how children or youth are better off as a result of the service provided)
- Prior history on grants awarded over the past two years including on-time reporting, progress on performance measures, appropriate and timely use of past awards
- Effectiveness of collaboration with other non-profit organizations, partners and the City Youth and Family Services Division
- Project budget rationale
- Qualifications of personnel
- Completion, timeliness of application materials

A revised RFP and scoring rubric will be used to score applicants on the criteria above and funding amounts will be awarded according to the formula below. The chart below is based on 100-point total score on criteria and is flexible per funding needs:

Original Proposed Funding Matrix

Evaluation Score Range	Evaluation Score Range Level	Project/ Program Funding Ceiling
↓ 90 – 100 ↑	High	↓ \$66,000 – \$75,500 – \$85,000 ↑
↓ 80 – 89 ↑	Medium-High	↓ \$46,000 – \$55,500 – \$65,000 ↑
↓ 70 – 79 ↑	Medium	↓ \$36,000 – \$40,500 – \$45,000 ↑
↓ 60 – 69 ↑	Medium-Low	↓ \$26,000 – \$30,500 – \$35,000 ↑
↓ 51 – 59 ↑	Low	↓ \$16,000 – \$20,500 – \$25,000 ↑
<50	Below	No funding recommended

Final Approved Funding Matrix

Evaluation Score Range	Evaluation Score Range Level	Project/ Program Funding Ceiling
↓ 80 – 89 ↑	High	↓ \$66,000 – \$75,500 – \$85,000 ↑
↓ 70 – 79 ↑	Medium	↓ \$46,000 – \$55,500 – \$65,000 ↑
↓ 61 – 69 ↑	Low	↓ \$36,000 – \$40,500 – \$45,000 ↑
<60	Below	No funding recommendations

With the following conditions: Scores <65 get 50% decrease in funds; 7.5% decrease across all funds to balance overall budget; allocation of additional \$21,000 to the innovation fund

Discovery:

- *During scoring, not one proposal received a score of 90 or above.*

- *Change of the matrix was based on an adjusted range due to inequities in funding distribution, for example:*
 - *Those agencies that asked for a smaller amount received their full funding request, regardless of if the score was low.*
 - *Those agencies that scored high, with a higher funding ask received significantly less in funding than those agencies that scored low.*
- *Exception: Innovation fund awards would not be determined by above formula but determination could be two set amounts, either \$2,500 or \$5,000, with awards*
- *Criteria includes assessment of project budget (does budget make sense)*
- *Assumption – City is supporting a higher level of funding for projects that align to priorities and support agencies with high potential to make an impact/contribute toward turning the curve.*