Welcome and introductions Matt Morton, Youth Development Council Chair - Chair Morton called the meeting to order, and asked for the roll call of council members attending in person and by phone.

At the start of the meeting, Matt Morton provided the Council with a handout of 18 questions council member and Oregon Juvenile Directors’ Association President Faye Fagel had drafted and sent the previous afternoon regarding the House Bill 3231 Funding Allocation Plan. Matt said the questions had been answered by staff. Council members were also supplied dates for the 2014 quarterly meetings so they could be added to members’ calendars.

HB 3231 Youth Development Council Funding Allocation Plan – Lolenzo Poe, Educational Supports and Developmental Assets Committee Lead and committee members Jaime Arredondo, Tim Sinatra, and Blanca Gutierrez, with Matt Tschabold, YDC Operations and Policy Analyst Chair Morton reminded the council that the Educational Supports and Developmental Assets Committee took the lead on creating this plan. The committee had unanimously moved this Funding Allocation model forward. The committee presented the model to the council and answered questions.

Lolenzo thanked the council for spending time visiting communities during the Community Engagement process. Tim Sinatra said the Funding Allocation Plan captures the intent of the Youth Development Council. Tim said the model would localize input and give people in the community a voice on what is working in their communities and provide a foundation to create a truly collaborative collective impact approach. He said it provides continuity of funding for existing programs that have an impact. Tim said the funding allocation relies on common Indicators of Need and focuses on outcomes across the state.
Jaime Arredondo added that this document incorporates the Oregon Education Investment Board’s Equity Lens that was previously approved by the council. Jaime was pleased that the need for community input was incorporated into the funding model. Blanca Gutierrez, another member of the ESDA Committee, said the community voice is present in this document. She stated this is a good change in how the funds could be distributed to under-served populations and that this funding plan allows for a better approach to invest resources and have a bigger impact.

YDC Policy Analyst Matt Tschabold shared that the committee has been working on developing the Funding Allocation Plan for over a year and a half, and the first important milestone was about to take place. He described the plan’s foundational principles, the community investment strategy, and reviewed various community-based methodological approaches to solving social issues to determine what approach would best fit the work of the Youth Development Council.

The committee determined that the Collective Impact methodology being used by other institutions in the education system which is already widespread and successful in communities was the approach that would best align with and support the council’s work. The result of the three components of work has led to the formation of four recommendations:

1. The population focus of the Youth Development Council should be Opportunity Youth and Priority Youth.
2. The goals of the Youth Development Council should be reconnecting Opportunity Youth with education and career, and establishing a secure connection for Priority Youth with education and career, and addressing youth violence and crime.
3. These goals should be accomplished by developing state policy, and funding community-based efforts that address barriers to education and career success.
4. The funding that supports community-based efforts should be administered through the Youth Development Council in four need-based grant funds.
   i. The Youth and Community Grant Fund (Federal and State Funds)
   ii. The Youth and Gangs Grant Fund (State Funds)
   iii. The Youth and Innovation Grant Fund (State Funds)
   iv. The Youth and Crime Prevention Fund (Federal Funds)

The committee gave an overview of the grant funds. One recommendation the committee had was that these funds be used as the mechanism with which the council supports community-based efforts to address barriers to education and career success for Oregon’s Opportunity and Priority Youth. The committee members then answered questions posed by the council. Faye Fagel had two questions: she wanted to know if the document had any major changes from the last time the council met. Matt said the only changes were regarding the procurement process within ODE. She also wanted to know the difference between a competitive grant process and an application process. Matt said the structure of the application scoring and the higher scoring applications would be ones that the community can prove through need-based data Indicators of Need. John Teague wanted to know what the YDC learned from the Community Engagement Process. Director Bell said that nearly all council members participated in the process, as well as staff, and that many themes were repeated across the state, including concerns
about equity, concerns about before- and after-school programs, and the need for better coordinated mental health services for youth. Iris said these recurrent themes were then shared with the ESDA Committee. Matt Tschabold said as council members and staff returned from Community Engagement meetings, the information was collected and compiled into the funding allocation plan. Chief Teague said he was struck by mental health issues, and had heard from counties and tribes concerns that the plan would remove the current formula for funding of the JCP funds. Iris acknowledged that concern, and passed out a document compiling meetings the staff and council had with juvenile departments and county commissioners around the state, engaging them in this conversation. Matt Tschabold said the one way the ESDA Committee thought it could address worries about reduced funding for programs and services in smaller communities was to assure a cap and floor. He said high needs communities, including those with a high poverty rate and high unemployment rate, could apply for more funding as well.

In response to a question from Tribal Representative David Fullerton, Matt Tschabold said each tribe could apply for up to five grants, even if the county in which that tribe resides also submitted five grants of its own. David also asked if non-profits could be funded before a county or tribe in that area would be funded. Matt responded that non-profits could not be funded unilaterally; they could only be funded if the collective group agreed the non-profit should apply for the funding for that community.

YDC member Meghan Moyer remarked that she wanted to make certain that communities understood that in order to succeed, applicants must have all the appropriate people representing all facets around the table to demonstrate a collective impact approach, including educators, juvenile departments, etc.

ESDA Chair Lolenzo Poe wanted to make certain that it’s understood that this process will not exclude anyone. He reiterated that it’s important that communities who are to be served must be at the table to help determine how the funds are used.

**Remarks Before Calling the Final Vote, Chair Morton**

Chair Morton asked to make a few remarks prior to the vote on the Funding Allocation Plan, saying that in 2011, Governor Kitzhaber began a process to not simply reform and restructure education in the State of Oregon, but to reframe how we approach public investment in our communities. Under the Governor’s leadership, the Oregon Education Investment Board was created, and Oregon set a first-in-the-nation goal of ensuring that all of its citizens earn at least a high school degree by the year 2025. Matt said the Governor gathered leaders from across the state in early childhood to craft an Early Learning System with the singular task of making certain that children enter kindergarten ready to learn. The Governor worked with leaders in the legislature to make significant investments in education and workforce development systems, and aligned the goals of these institutions toward education and career success, regardless of program areas.

Matt said the Governor appointed the Youth Development Council, charged with the task of making difficult decisions for some of Oregon’s highest needs youth. He said the funding allocation plan the council was about to vote on is one that will ensure programs and services are available for high needs and high risk youth in all corners of the state. It is a plan that increases inclusiveness and ensures that community decision-making is supported by state resources.
Finally, he said it is a plan that will help those youth who struggle the most succeed by setting the bar at no less than educational success and career advancement as acceptable goals.

The Chair said he knows that the Governor supports this direction, and that it is an essential component to complete the Governor’s P-20 system. He said he was excited about moving in this direction, and was hopeful for the impact this will have on youth in each community. Chair Morton finished his remarks by stating he has the distinct honor of calling the roll for this important vote.

Public Testimony Prior to Vote

Levi Herrera-Lopez, Executive Director, Mano a Mano Family Center – Levi wanted to express his appreciation and to commend the Youth Development Council and the committee for designing the Funding Allocation Plan and the emphasis it placed on collective impact. He wanted to urge the committee to be vigilant about ensuring community self-determination in playing a key role allocation funding process, and to ensure that the backbone organization in each community be savvy about the needs in the community and be aware that they need to involve the programs that represent those youth they will be serving.

OTHER COMMENTS PRIOR TO VOTE

John Teague said he was concerned that the council was about to make a change to JCP funds when it has been proven that they are working well currently. He is concerned about putting the funds into a program that has not been proven to work.

Youth member Renee Hernandez said some communities were under the impression they would run out of money and were left in the air. Matt Tschabold responded that many communities were busy aligning their outcomes to the YDC mission and that communities had been repeatedly told that the application process for this funding would change in one more fiscal year from how they had been historically funded to a new system. Matt said this message dated back to the previous legislative session, a message carried not only by the Governor and legislature but also told to communities during all of the Community Engagement meetings held across the state. Matt said letters were sent to all Boards of County Commissioners and Tribal Councils immediately after the close of the last session informing them of the impending change,

Janet Arenz said it was her impression that no one would be left out; all would be able to compete for this funding, and it would strengthen the process, leveling the playing field for everyone. There will be targeted outcomes, known opportunities, and Janet said Juvenile Directors have a very good chance to compete equitably for this money; she said the doesn’t need to be a carve out for JCP funding.

Chair Matt Morton said the fear isn’t based on the loss of programs as much as it is the loss of exclusivity to a funding source. Chair Morton said the new funding model encourages evidence based funding. He said if the council is committed to the Equity Lens, Collective Impact, committed to reaching out to Opportunity and Priority Youth, and committed to a community-driven process, why wouldn’t this be a process inclusive of all people at the table? He thinks it’s a pivotal chance to move forward to support what the Governor and Legislature set out for the council to achieve, Chair Morton
then read into the record his comments that included the council’s task for achieving a milestone after 18 months of studying the issue. He is confident the council is moving in the right direction. He said he was excited to move forward and see the impact it will have in communities.

Faye Fagel then said “…I appreciate the ability to have submitted questions; there were quite a few, 18 I believe, and I appreciate the time that you took to provide answers, and that the answers were very helpful to bring some clarity.” She was concerned about Chair Morton’s comments about there being exclusivity to a funding source. She said the concern is more about having continuity of services to youth in the community. She said the JCP process had been in place for a long time, with a version of Collective Impact in place. Another concern she has is about services shutting down before others are gearing up. She said there are collective bargaining and contractual agreements regarding contractors, so that timelines of potential layoffs are troublesome. She said there were external evaluations which provided data, and she is not sure the ESDA Committee or community members ever saw those documents. She would have liked to have viewed a community engagement summary of minutes. She said JCP funding has been measurable and accountable through a validated risk assessment tool and a shared data system.

She said Innovation funding will have to go to the legislature for the release of that funding. She said two counties have obtained legal counsel regarding the allocation formula for JCP funding being in statute. She said Matt had indicated that in the February Session, legislation would be put forth to would change that statute to allow for those funds to be allocated. Faye continued by saying it is her belief this allocation contradicts current law on how these funds should be allocated, and that there are at least two pieces of the RFA process that will be delayed. Iris said the process of the Innovation Funds would be delayed a bit as part of the process. As for statute changes, Iris said the Governor would be submitting a bill to support the direction of the council. Faye said legislators will then vote on that bill as part of the regular legislative process.

Faye continued with her statement, saying the proposed new system doesn’t have shared risk assessment on the individuals to be served or a data collection system for evaluating outcomes. Faye said there is the ability to keep the existing Juvenile Crime Prevention system and keep funding in place for the second half of the biennium. Then they could compare the outcomes of the new funding formula and investments versus the current JCP process. Then a comparison could be done to to see if the investments are equal to or better than the current system.

**Roll Call Vote on HB 3231 Funding Allocation Plan - Matt Morton, Chair**

**Call for the roll:** Jay Dixon, yes; Janet Arenz, yes; Mary Arnold, not present; Jaime Arredondo, yes; Agnes Balassa, yes (Iris read Agnes’s “yes” vote into the record, saying Agnes had to drop off the call for the meeting; Agnes saying she “…was impressed with the process that led to the development of the recommendations and the quality and thoughtfulness of the proposal”; Martha Brooks (Iris read her email into the record: “…voting “no”, but that it would be a ‘yes’ if the JCP funds were left in place as in statute as decided by JCPAC’); Martha Doyle, no; Faye Fagel, no; Brenda Frank, yes; David Fullerton, yes; Blanca Gutierrez, yes; Frank Hanna-Williams, no; Alicia Hayes, yes; Renee Hernandez, no; Ted Martinez, no; Meghan Moyer, yes; Brian Pham, not available, Lolenzo Poe, yes; Tim Sinatra, yes; John Teague, no; Matt Morton, yes.

The HB 3231 Funding Allocation Plan passed with 12 votes in favor and 7 against. There was one abstention (Mary Arnold, not present and recovering from surgery) and one absent (Pham).
Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.