

Commission on Out of School Time Grants and Youth Outcomes
Meeting Minutes
May 17, 2018 6:00pm – 7:30pm
One Judiciary Square, 441 4th Street NW, Room 1107 South, Washington, DC 20001

Commissioners In Attendance: Valrie Brown (designee Sheryl Hamilton), Mark Hecker, Darby Hickey (designee Councilmember David Grosso), Burnell Holland, Karla Kelly (designee Vanessa Gerideau), Travaughn Kinney, Jiselle O’Neal, Walter Peacock, Heather Peeler, Matthew Reif (designee Lisa McNeill), Margaret Siegel, Aurora Steinle, Mila Yochum (Acting Chairperson)

Commissioners Absent: Tacharna Crump (excused), Jeanette Kowalik (excused), Anisah Rasheed (excused), Maggie Riden (excused)

Attending Staff Members: Debra Eichenbaum, Lisa Rucker, Franck Tchoukeu, Jeremy Welsh-Loveman

I. Call to Order

The Commission meeting was called to order by Yochum at 6:04 pm.

II. Public Comment

There were no official public comments.

III. Announcement of a Quorum

10 Members were present at time of roll call and quorum was announced.

IV. Approval of the Agenda

Hickey moved to approve agenda. Hecker seconded the motion. Unanimous approval, agenda approved.

V. Approval of the Minutes

Siegel asked about the need for detailed minutes. Yochum explained that in order to be in compliance with the Open Meeting Act the minutes need to capture as much detail as possible so that someone could read the minutes and know exactly what occurred. Eventually the room will be audio and/or video capable in the future. Then there will be no need to take minutes in so much detail.

Steinle moved to approve the minutes with minor editorial changes as supplied by Commissioner Siegel. O’Neal seconded the motion. None opposed. Holland abstained. Minutes approved with minor editorial changes.

Peeler and Peacock arrive at 6:09.

VI. Draft Bylaws

Commissioners were given the opportunity to amend or correct the draft bylaws. No changes were advised. A roll call vote will occur next month to adopt the bylaws.

Siegel: Do we need a definition of what Executive Session is as stated in Article VI, Standing Committees, Section 3(e)? Are they already defined somewhere?

Yochum: Under the Open Meetings Act, Executive Sessions are defined.

Yochum: Having no other questions, Commissioners were reminded to consider nomination of officers at the July meeting.

VII. Updates, Office of Out of School Time Grants and Youth Outcomes

Yochum provide the following update: The OST Office is new and launched in October 2017. The grantmaking process continues to improve. The evolution within the last few years has been informed by feedback from community members through focus groups and one-on-one meetings. We made a number of changes to the process and grantmaking based on information and data. The School Year 2017-18 (SY 17-18) Request for Proposals (RFP) was the first competition that the OST Office changed using data and we continue to refine the RFP based on community feedback while working with our grantmaking partner and their requirements and process. A handout was provided (Appendix A).

For Summer 2018 grant competition – the following changes occurred.

- The RFP and rubric was improved to be clearer and we continue to refine the RFP for clarity.
- Grantmaking partner provided mandated training for all reviewers; they had to participate in training and score a mock proposal before receiving any proposals to read.
- Organizations who had overhead/indirect expenses over 20% were ineligible to apply
- Targeted funding to District of Columbia Housing Authority (DCHA) via two coordinating entities to contract with grassroots organizations to target funding and create two full day summer camps at two separate DCHA sites. That happened because we learned from summer 2017 that there were very few applicants for DCHA sites.

In FY18 the total number of applicants who received funding was 38 and 39%. For SY17-18 no organization was fully funded, everyone was partially funded. In summer some were fully funded and some partially. Between school year and summer competition, there were a total of 30 organizations with budgets less than \$250,000 and a total of 138 organizations with budgets over \$250,000. 168 organizations applied for funding.

Other data points, for SY17-18 we focused more on the ward where programming occurred since we did not have the OST needs assessment and we used the poverty data. For summer, we used the needs assessment to inform the competition to determine need and the at risk population.

Holland: A question on last slide, any background as to why there is a drop in the number of organizations funded with budgets under \$250K?

Yochum: Not a drop, but actually an increase from the school year grants to the summer grants in terms of the number of organizations who applied and had budgets under \$250K. Goal is to learn about all OST organizations and engage with them even if they don't apply for our funding.

Siegel: How many small organizations are single sites or multiple sites? Perhaps that is skewing the organizational budget size. I wonder if we are comparing apples to oranges, because we would expect more sites would equal larger budgets. It would be helpful for us to be able to compare multi-site to single site.

Steinle: We can pull that data.

Hecker: Can you clarify the 2% for other?

Yochum: Those organizations program outside DC, they take DC youth to a camp or other location.

Hickey: These slides are great, and they could inform the strategic plan discussion. Can we receive a copy of the charts?

Yochum: The powerpoint will be part of the minutes and will be emailed to all Commissioners. (Appendix B) We can share the charts as well. The last slide is the plans for FY19 grant competitions. We anticipate for SY18-19 three competitions, one for current SY17-18 grantees who will receive continuation awards pending performance and compliance. 41 organizations could receive continuation awards. The second is the annual competition. We anticipate 25 organizations will be funded. The last one is a new competition, community based which would be for smaller grant awards and we would eliminate the audit requirement and reduce the minimum number of participants served. It would roughly fund 20 organizations. All together we would fund approximately 86 organizations.

Aurora: The big caveat is the budget. Final amounts will fluctuate based on the final budget, but we wanted to introduce the idea that this is the structure-continuation grants, a competition similar to past years and then the community-based competition.

Yochum: This information is not yet public, we are sharing it with the commission first. One question we would like feedback from the commission is how to define the small community based, locally led, grassroots, emerging organizations. One big conversation we've had here is how to get money to the smaller, more grassroots organizations. We want the application process to be less burdensome, but we also need to define who would be eligible for this competition. While organizations can apply for either competition, this one does not require an audit or financial review.

Brown: Can you speak to that around budget. I'm with 21st century and we do have some small organizations that are doing good work and they know the community but they don't apply for 21st century because of the federal requirements. I wonder if there is something we can do to better help these small organizations compete.

Peeler: Aside from the financial requirements and smaller number of participants, are the other requirements the same?

Yochum: We are also reducing the burden of the grant application.

Peeler: But the quality requirements stay the same?

Yochum: Yes. We might also reduce the training requirements, but we need high quality programs. They can choose which workshops they will attend between program training and capacity building.

Brown: Could we also provide technical assistance?

Yochum: That is something we would work with our grantmaking partner to provide. We would need to work with The Institute to see what kind of capacity we have.

Hickey: This is an important idea, it could be very helpful. I remember when I ran a small organization and we were able to hire someone to help us out it was very transformational. What was the number that you said for this cohort? For the community based grant competition.

Yochum: about 20 organizations

Siegel: However we can allocate money that supports the small organization and doesn't come from the small organizations budgets and instead from our budget is helpful. We can create the framework that gets these organizations technical assistance without another source of onerous requirements. It comes

down to budget size and staff. Commissioner Crump has a lot of thoughts and sent some interesting ideas around and I'm sorry she's not here to comment on it.

Peeler: For the community based grant competition I think we really need to make it as less burdensome as possible and maybe take on more risk, less hoops, less requirements, more flexibility. This would include fewer restrictions on how the funding can be used. Commissioner Crump said something about comparing the request to the organizational budget.

Yochum: Comparing the request to the organization budget is not a consideration or part of our rubric. We do not compare funding request as a percent to the overall organizational budget.

Hecker: I think that it makes sense to include some budget information, including a cap. However that might not be enough to identify organizations that are tied to the community, perhaps we would need organizations to be nominated by someone in the community, just because they have a small budget doesn't mean they are connected to the community.

Brown: We should make sure we hold these organizations accountable. Perhaps we could look to some historical track record on outcomes that speaks to accountability and credibility.

Peeler: We want to support new organizations so asking for historical information would hurt them. What can we ask for that speaks to accountability and credibility?

Kelley: Do we ask for recommendations or Letters of Support?

Yochum: We do accept letters of support, but they aren't always about the community and they are not usually a good measure. Is the budget size of \$250K fair?

Siegel: I might increase the budget limit to \$350,000

Hickey: I might go the other way.

Holland: \$350K sounds like a lot for emerging organizations. If they have credibility in the community they probably got some space in-kind. Thinks the number is probably \$200 -150K

Hecker: I started an organization and by the time we got to \$250K we had two FTEs and 120 kids, so \$250K feels fair to me. What really drove me crazy was how some grants prevented you from applying if you were less than 3 years old.

Brown: Are they required to have partners?

Yochum: For some organizations, based on our conversations, it's hard to describe partnerships in a way that allows reviewers to understand. They feel like they don't describe these partnerships very well. Then we say "How about letters of support?" but the CBOs say that they write the letters anyway and give them to the partners to sign.

Peeler: Perhaps they could provide references, so the burden is on us rather than on them and the grantmaking partner would contact.

Hecker: So for the applications now you have reviewers who are trained to review the applications? Could we do site visits for the community grants?

Yochum: We have the FY19 grantmaking partner RFP out, so we would need to ask them if they could do site visits.

Brown: That is a great idea. For 21st Century, before we announce awards to programs that are not in schools we do site visits to check on the organizations.

O'Neal: Does that mean we would then develop a rubric for these site visits?

Hecker: Would the grant making partner then make the rubric?

Yochum: We would ask them or work with them to develop a rubric on a site visit. I like the idea, I'm just concerned because programming is ending soon, so we might have missed our window for site visits. I don't think it will be feasible for FY19. It's something we could look towards for FY20.

Hecker: I think it's something to work toward.

Siegel: To apply an organization needs to serve X number of children? What is the number for the community based RFP?

Yochum: For the community based it is 15. For the school year competition it is 30. We do minimums not maximums.

Hickey: The councilman went to a place last year that was run by one woman, there were about 12 kids. She wasn't doing anything that probably would result in outcomes, but she had the connection and she was keeping the kids out of trouble. I think that kind of program is ideal. We need to allow for flexibility in meeting the criteria since the organizations come in all shapes and forms.

Yochum: We could combine the site visit with this idea of relationships. A lot of the quality work is around the quality of the relationships.

Brown: Are we thinking about a site visit before the award is made?

Yochum: Yes, before the decision is made.

Siegel: Yes because a CBO could hire a grant writer and write a good proposal but then you go there and there's no connection.

Peeler: We should take risks. A few may slip though, but we could tie in the site visit with the capacity building and the TA.

Hecker: I like Darby's story. Maybe we let the CBO decide how to put forward their best self. They choose 3 of the 5 ways to tell us about themselves.

Steinle: Evidence could be some letters or provide options for CBOs to show they have community support through videos or testimonials.

Yochum: As we are looking to define "community based" it will be organizations with budget less than \$250,000. Some connection to the community that they also supply some evidence of community support and then provide them some option in how they demonstrate their program's worth; 3 to 5 ways to describe program and provide evidence either in testimonials, letters of support, video, pictures, etc. Is that fair in how we describe these community-based organizations.

Peeler: Do they have to be 501(c)3's and can they have a fiscal sponsor?

Yochum: We didn't put in the option of fiscal sponsor because we heard from small programs that the sponsor took part of funds, but we left that as an option for the larger competition.

Kelly: Can they be multi-site?

Yochum: They can be multi-site if the budget is \$250K or less.

Peeler: What do you anticipate the average grant size to be?

Yochum: We expect the maximum award to be \$25,000.

Holland: I don't want to make things more difficult, but should we add some option if there can't be a site visit that the grant maker has to talk to a minimum of X participants to bring the program to life in some way.

Brown: Would the CBOs identify the parents and youth? If so, they will select and coach.

Hecker: Likes the idea of trying to bring the program to life.

Yochum: We did talk before about references. So we could say they need a minimum of X number of references which includes family and partners.

Siegel: I am ok with that as long as we give priority to site visits whenever possible.

Holland: I think we should require site visits but that could be too burdensome. We should try and have some human touch point

Kinney: Do the grant makers look at the type of programs being issued or being the done at the site. Would they be willing to give more money to a program with more IT stuff as opposed to program giving juice boxes and playing video games.

Yochum: A site visit can help here. They can look at how engaged the youth are, but right now not looking at programming in that way for funding purposes.

Kinney: What about age and content? It would be good to include something in rubric that helps kids get careers. I ask because a study on the news showed that Fortune 500 companies are giving jobs to college grads, if we look at 13 -17 year olds as the next set of leaders and giving these kids the chance to go to college, we need to look at content. I myself am finishing school and I am finishing a degree in counter intelligence. The content is more important than the credibility of the organization.

Hickey: However they need credibility to get kids in the door. I think the goal of this type of grant is to make sure we support organizations that do the work and have the relationships. Content is important, but for the community based grants the connection is what matters most.

Hecker: Do we believe the opposite can happen? That there are organizations that have great models and then get them support in the community.

Hickey: We have talked about it but we also want to support the small home grown organizations and not the large ones that come in.

Brown: We need to support organizations that do a certain kind of work that is particularly needed.

Yochum: I'll share an informal study we did in Pittsburgh with older youth. We asked youth if they would prefer a program that only provided a safe space but was staffed with the people they had a relationship with or if they can participate on a different program with different staff but lots of stuff and activities. The youth didn't care about all the bells and whistles and preferred the program that had the strong relationships with the staff. And we see this all the time where there are leaders who have the relationships. So that gets to the importance of capacity building to help them get to the point where they can deliver great content and take them to the next level.

Yochum: For the FY19 community based grants, we will keep the organizational budget to \$250K, references, testimonials, work products, letters of support, pictures, videos, but we won't have time to do the site visits. Thank you all for that. This will inform the FY19 grant.

VIII. Strategic Plan Discussion

Yochum: Now we will move on to the strategic plan. Thank you to Commissioner Hecker for the work and the other commissioners who provided feedback. Yellow highlights are words or areas of concern from the community focus group. After our first community engagement session we highlighted some areas that they were concerned about. We moved youth voice up to the top since the providers said that should be the most important. Mark I'm going to pass it on to you.

Hecker: I agreed to facilitate this part of the meeting. In our conversations we really dug into the vision and the values. I think it's good to go one at a time. The biggest points in our discussions were the differences between outcomes and values. I think it would be important to talk about equitable outcomes not just access.

O'Neal: Why are outcomes highlighted?

Yochum: They thought opportunities would be better than outcomes.

O'Neal: How do they define the difference between outcomes and opportunities?

Yochum: Outcomes are the result. Depending on the program the outcomes could be different for every kid. It's harder to say outcomes are equitable from a provider standpoint since all the kids are different. Opportunities are what's available and can be the same for youth.

Brown: Institutions can aim for equitable outcomes, but equitable outcomes aren't possible for all the students. Each student's needs are different, so it would be hard to get equitable outcomes. Programs could be academic or for enrichment.

Yochum: Providers said it would be hard to define what outcomes could be across the system.

Holland: I'm ok with the word "outcomes" because it's the vision, it's where we aspire to be, not where we are right now. We aspire to be somewhere where there are equitable outcomes across the city. It is outcomes with the intent that young people will develop the skills and knowledge necessary to be successful adults and citizens able to contribute to their community. The ultimate goal is to make sure they are quality citizens. I think that's the vision, it's sort of semantics. I'm fine with it, but I get the concern from the provider standpoint. We shouldn't lower the standard.

Hecker: In other discussions we were thinking of it at the macro level. We were thinking of the graduation rates being the same in ward 8 as ward 2. The goal is to produce a system that eventually creates more equitable outcomes.

O'Neal: They have a window to define what equitable outcomes are for them.

Peeler: The vision is not that outcomes are tied to one program. We should keep it at the more macro systems perspective level. I don't know what we mean by full access (in the strategic plan).

Hecker: We were going to identify the needs and address those. We want access to meet the need. Though that is not something I am married to. The intention that access meets needs. The important thing is that it's needs driven.

Siegel: Access means that we won't cherry pick kids and an important piece of our vision to have full access.

Steinle: Equitable outcomes, there is equity of opportunity because some students require more investment. It's not about equal. Equity of opportunity to achieve outcomes sort of blurs two ideas together. I propose we put in something about how "all children and youth in DC have full access to..." and then something about all children and youth achieve outcomes. In vision we want equity in outcomes because we want to show what the system is trying to accomplish.

Hecker: The vision is about achieving equity in outcomes, the tactic to reach that is providing equity in opportunity.

Kinney: We could just substitute opportunity for outcomes.

Steinle: We want to keep focus on what we need to accomplish.

Kinney: I think they both mean the same thing. We are just making it easier for the provider.

Siegel: We want to get to results, so outcomes are the end piece.

Brown: Can't say the District wants all students to have X outcomes if we don't define what those outcomes are. I don't see how all youth will have equitable outcomes. Of course the schools can say that they can set the targets, but to have all youth in the District achieve equitable outcomes, we need to be able to state what those outcomes are.

Kinney: Because outcomes would be equal.

Steinle: Perhaps this discussion is too abstract. It would be good to hold our feet to the fire. We need to draw the line to the big stuff we are trying to move the needle on such as graduation rates.

Holland: The way you framed it, it's all working as part of a larger puzzle. The other elements of the city that will step up and provide support so the school systems goals can be achieved, a lot of that is contingent on how strong the out of school time program is. I don't think we are that far off. If we have to go deeper in saying what those outcomes are then the last line is starting to get there. It's hard to draw a direct line from programming that we are providing a middle schooler and their ability to perform in their career 12 years later they don't have the student 24 hours a day, so OST can play a role. But we can play a role. We can contribute to the process.

Peeler: I was starting to go in that direction as well, thinking about what we want to achieve. The final clause is most important. What do we ultimately want to achieve. Children and youth have the skills to succeed in the workplace, in school and in their community.

Hecker: The last clause is our vision.

Siegel: Through a system or institutions that operate in equitable manners and provide... Vision need to incorporate both the kid piece and the system piece.

Kinney: It's different when we talk about ward 2, 3 and 4 where the parents can pay for better programs. For wards 7 and 8, which are our target neighborhoods, I think the word opportunity will make them more comfortable than the word outcomes, because the opportunities they are afforded are much less, some kids are going to die some kids are going to school and finish, some will not finish.

Brown: Do we want access and opportunity.

Hecker: I'm feeling a little stuck at the moment. I think we can build it around either word, I'm sensing a split in the group. Do we want to try and insert more in here, but that sounds a little ridiculous. Is that too much?

Yochum: One comment from the provider is that whatever we write should be youth friendly.

Peeler: It might be better to just cut to the chase and start at the end. "Children and youth across the district have the skills, knowledge and abilities to succeed in their communities...through access to high quality out of school time programming".

Siegel: I don't want to be beating a dead horse, but our vision only has the system piece. Feels to me we need a little bit more.

Peeler: We could say "because of a supportive ecosystem of high quality out of school time programs".

Brown: by providing quality afterschool programs.

Kinney: So we are looking for a kid friendly transition word.

Holland: Can we recap where we are currently?

Hecker: "All children and youth across the District have the skills, attitudes and knowledge necessary to succeed in school, the work place and their communities through a system supporting high quality out of school time programs."

Peacock: Can we change succeed to achieve?

Holland: I think we are missing equity, I guess it's implied through "all children" and opportunity is implied through "full access".

Siegel: The question is where we put the "full access" piece.

Hecker: I think we have a chance in the values section to define what we mean by high quality and that will include equity.

Holland: The most important word is "all".

Hecker: Now we can move forward with values. We moved youth voice to the top. Healthy ecosystem is not youth friendly and hard for folks to understand.

Yochum: Providers didn't like the word "to encourage youth voice" and they think that healthy ecosystem is not youth voice friendly. Other feedback was that healthy eco system sounds like collective action.

Steinle: I think with "healthy ecosystem" is a subject we are dancing around and what we talked about earlier. It's why we value different organizations.

Peeler: The idea of the ecosystem with different models, different sized organizations, etc. The dynamic aspects of the whole system, is not being addressed.

Hecker: Do we think by reworking collective action we can say all of that, the need to support these small community based organizations.

Hickey: I wonder if what we are discussion now should really fall under goals. I think we could work it into collective action. Maybe we should straightforwardly say something like "there is a value to have an organization being led by someone in the community".

Hecker: Maybe we could add something in front of stakeholders to indicate we want some "diverse group" it's unclear what the qualifier would be.

Holland: I think they both add value, collective action and healthy ecosystem. It's good to have neighborhood relationships and a wide variety of types of programs and offerings. It's another thing to have the organizations work together and have some type of integration.

Peacock: My interpretation of collective action was that all organizations shared the same goal, whereas for health ecosystem the goal was to have a good variety of goals and a healthy balance.

Hickey: Ecosystem is less about a value and more about a goal. Having a healthy ecosystem is the best tactic toward collective action.

Hecker: What are people's thoughts on the Youth Voice? What about "children and youth contribute directly to decisions that will impact their lives?"

Hecker: Do we feel ok with equity and commitment to learning as they are now? Are we okay reducing the values from 5 to 4? Do people feel solid with addressing collective action under healthy ecosystem?

Peeler: Might be better to rephrase the commitment to learning... "Continuous improvement in learning leads to stronger and more effective organizations and programs and better results for children and youth"

Hecker: Do we want any explicit reference to the use of data to inform that?

Siegel: That's already in the goals.

Hecker: Are we solid with the values?

Steinle: Since we moved collective action to a goal, what we are saying is that funding organizations that are better connected to the community will get better outcomes for our youth. I hope that by putting it into goals we are not walking back the value of those organizations.

Hecker: I feel like we have agreement around the table on this.

Hickey: Do we drop "share their experiences" from youth voice.

Holland: I think it's stronger without it.

Steinle: Commissioner Brown has a good recommendation to change "through a system" to "by providing a system that supports".

Holland: How do people feel about "supporting", it feels too weak? Perhaps change it to "providing a system that ensures high quality".

Yochum: Are we ok with this? We are sharing this at another community meeting on the 24th. Then we will move toward goals next month. All commissioners agree with draft of values.

Hecker: I would be willing to lead this next time, but also eager for other voices.

Yochum: Siegel moved to adjourn. Holland seconded. Unanimous approval, meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

School Year 2017-18 Out-of-School Time Grant Competition

We hear you!

We heard....	Changes in the School Year 2017-18 Grant Competition
<i>Funding should support the children and youth who are most in need of free and low-cost programming.</i>	The RFP includes a preference for organizations that serve children and youth who are most in need or at-risk and require access to high-quality, low- or no-cost OST opportunities. The program narrative also includes a focus on how organizations are meeting identified community needs.
<i>Funding focused on offering specific programs limits flexibility to fund organizational needs across programs and, on a limited basis, administrative costs.</i>	The RFP is focused on funding organizations that are administering great programs and can demonstrate how additional funding would support that work. Switching from a program-focused funding model to an organization-focused one will provide a more complete picture of OST.
<i>The audit requirement is a barrier to applying and not fair for smaller non-profits.</i>	The audit requirement remains a requirement in the RFP. However, if an applicant's organization's annual budget is \$250,000 or less we will accept financial review report from an independent certified public accountant.
<i>The submission of all expenditure receipts is burdensome.</i>	Grantees will no longer be required to supply receipt documentation for each of their expenditures under the grant. Instead, grantees will be required to submit signed, detailed quarterly expenditure reports along with a General Ledger report that represent an accurate accounting of the allowable expenses. By requiring the audit, this requirement was removed to provide the necessary assurances.
<i>Standard grant sizes are too small to justify the administrative burden of compliance for my organization.</i>	While programs may apply for any size grant, the maximum amount that will be granted to a single grantee is \$150,000.
<i>My budget is too small to rely on a reimbursement system for large expenditures such as start-up costs and salaries.</i>	Grantees will receive payment through disbursements throughout the year. A 10% payment at the beginning of the grant year (Around September), 40% payment will follow in December and March and 10% after receipt of the final report.
<i>Collection and submission of all required staff clearances and other safety documents are too time intensive.</i>	Grantees are required to have all necessary clearances for all staff on file. However, instead of copying and submitting them to United Way, we will have grantees sign and attest to compliance with the requirements. A sample of clearances will be randomly checked during monitoring visits.
<i>Average Daily Attendance (ADA) is an unfair measure of a programs impact.</i>	Funding will no longer be disbursed based on ADA. However, grantees will be required to submit attendance data for all participants quarterly. In addition, attendance may be spot checked during monitoring visits.
<i>Daily program dosage didn't fit with our program design and was overly restrictive.</i>	The RFP is funding organizations that offer program(s) operating under a range of models, including those offering programming during intercessions, weekends, and intensives.
<i>We have to pick age groups and can only apply to serve participants at specific program sites.</i>	Grantees may now serve any young people between the ages of 5 and 18 and may apply funds to any of their sites as long as funds are used for District children and youth.
<i>I received the RFP late and missed the deadline for the Notice of Intent to Apply and the Grant Technical Assistance Session (GTA).</i>	A Notice of Intent to Apply and GTA is no longer required or mandatory. We strongly encourage participation in order for applicants to submit a competitive and well-written proposal.
<i>The District should support organizations that vary in size, tenure and scope; organizations should be representative of the students they serve.</i>	After the panel review, the OST System Set-up Team will evaluate all proposals with an equity lens. The equity review process is under development and will be defined by the DME and OST System Set-up Team, but will work to ensure more organizational equity in funding.

FY18 OST Grant Competitions

Description	Summer 2018		School Year 2017-18	
Number Applied	84		104	
Number Funded	32	38%	41	39%
Number Fully Funded	18	56%	0	0
Number partially funded	14	44%	41	100%
Funded in Prior Year Grant Competition	18	56%	16	39%
Applicants' Budgets				
Median Organization Budget	\$897,245		\$1.4 million	
Budgets under \$250,000	23	27%	12	11.5%

Grantee: Programming Sites by Ward**

Ward	Needs Assessment At-Risk		Summer 2018	School Year 17-18
	K-8	9	Proportion of Sites	Proportion of Sites
Ward 1	8%	14%	18%	2%
Ward 2	3%	5%	0	4%
Ward 3	1%	5%	0	2%
Ward 4	13%	15%	5%	17%
Ward 5	15%	15%	11%	8%
Ward 6	13%	12%	14%	15%
Ward 7	20%	15%	18%	18%
Ward 8	28%	19%	34%	33%
Other/Offsite			0	2%
Total Program Sites			100%	101%

FY19 School Year Grant Competition

- FY17-18 School Year OST Continuation
- FY18-19 School Year OST Grant Competition
- FY18-19 Out-of-School Time Community Based Grant Competition