

Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee - Minutes

Tuesday, May 20, 2014

2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Department of Workforce Services – 1385 South State Street, Salt Lake City

Committee Members: Karen Crompton, Bill Crim, Joe Piccolo, Ray Reutzel, Dr. Doug Goldsmith, Dr. Renee Olesen, Liz Zentner

Commission Members: David Burton

Excused: Judge Ric Oddone, William Duncan

Staff Support: Casey Erickson, Jessica Staker

Attendees: Mary Beth Vogel-Ferguson, Kim Auberger, Kristen Floyd, Karla Aguirre, Leslie Johnston, Drew Maxfield, Gina Cornia, Tracy Gruber, Sarah Nitta, Rachael Stewart, Rebekah Schwab, Sarah Tellesbo,

Phone Attendees: Carrie Mayne, Shelly Ivie, Ann Williamson, Sheila Walsh-McDonald

AGENDA	DISCUSSION	RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION
Welcome and Introductions	Welcome and Introductions (Bishop Burton) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of March 18th Committee meeting minutes 	Minutes were approved, as written, by the Advisory Committee.
Discuss Feedback from the Commission Recommendations	Discuss Feedback from the Commission Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Research Team will meet Friday, May 23rd. 	Karen Crompton will provide a summary of the Preschool Development Grant to send out.
Research Team Update	Research Team Update (Casey Erickson, Tracy Gruber) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce Tracy Gruber • Timeline and Status on Annual Report 	

HB 96 School Readiness Initiative FAQs

Background

1. Who is eligible to apply for these grants?

Existing preschool programs sponsored by public LEAs are eligible to apply through USOE. Private preschools will apply through the Department of Workforce Services.

The High Quality School Readiness Grant Program is created to provide grants to the following, in order to upgrade an existing preschool or home-based technology program to a high quality school readiness program: (a) an eligible private provider; (b) an eligible LEA; or (c) an eligible home-based educational technology provider. (Lines 217-219)

2. What will the grants programs fund?

The High-quality School Readiness Grant Program provides two types of grants: 1) grants to support independent evaluation to demonstrate results and to qualify for potential private investment; 2) grants to upgrade existing preschool programs to high-quality preschool programs and independent evaluation to demonstrate results.

3. Where do the funds come from for this program?

There will be a \$3 million ongoing appropriation from the General Fund, which will be used to pay for a competitive grants program and to repay contracts that have been negotiated where an independent evaluator certifies that agreed upon outcomes have been achieved.

4. Which department oversees this? Who administers the grants program? Who will negotiate contracts with private providers?

The bill creates a School Readiness Board within the Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB) composed of the director of Department of Workforce Services (DWS) or designee, a member appointed by the Utah State Board of Education (USOE), a member appointed by the chair of the State Charter School Board, a member appointed by the Speaker of House of Representatives, and a member appointed by the President of the Senate.

Grants will be awarded by the Board based on recommendations from USOE and DWS, to ensure all sectors are communicating and collaborating. The grants programs will be administered by the respective departments.

Grants awarded to school districts and charter schools will be administered by the USOE and the preschool program will be run by the local school districts and schools. Grants to private childcare providers will be administered by the DWS, but the preschool program will be run by the private providers receiving the grant.

Contracts with private investors will be negotiated by the School Readiness Board.

Definitions

1. Is there a formal definition for “economically disadvantaged”?

Eligible children must qualify for free- or reduced-price school lunch (i.e. have a family income of 185% of the Federal Poverty Level or below).

78 (2) "Economically disadvantaged" means a student who:

79 (a) is eligible to receive free lunch;

80 (b) is eligible to receive reduced price lunch; or

81 (c) (i) is not otherwise accounted for in Subsection (2) (a) or (b); and

82 (ii) (A) is enrolled in a Provision 2 or Provision 3 school, as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture;

84 (B) has a Declaration of Household Income on file;

85 (C) is eligible for a fee waiver; or

86 (D) is enrolled at a school that does not offer a lunch program and is a sibling of a

87 student accounted for in Subsection (2) (a) or (b).

Program requirements/eligibility

1. Is there a formal certification process by which a high quality preschool qualifies for a contract?

The School Readiness Board will determine and communicate the process by which a program will be determined to be high quality as that applies to the contracts.

2. If a program applies for funding through USOE, does that mean the program must be financially supported by an LEA?

Yes. Programs that apply through the USOE must be under the direction of an LEA. Employees of the program will be hired and paid through the LEA.

3. Should Head Start programs apply through USOE or DWS?

Programs that are under the direction of an LEA and have employees who are paid through the LEA must apply through the USOE.

4. Can a program that does not currently serve general education low-income students submit an application with the anticipation of including low income students?

No. A program must be able to demonstrate serving students who are low-income and general education to be eligible to apply for this program. Proposals serving the highest percentage of low income children will be the most competitive.

5. Must a program serve both three and four year old children to qualify for the funding?

No.

6. Can a program serve students who are turning five years old during the school year?

Yes. If a student who is four years old turns five during the school year s/he is enrolled in the program, the student can continue through to the end of the year and s/he enrolls in Kindergarten.

7. Is there a required number of hours per week for a preschool?

Most public preschool programs are half-day, four days a week, for four-year olds. In a daycare center, the preschool portion of the day is usually two and a half to three hours in the morning.

8. What constitutes a full-year preschool program?

A program that runs at least through the academic school year (nine months).

9. Can a program that runs during the academic school year, but not the summer, apply for this funding?

Yes.

10. Can a preschool program that is a summer or bridge program (3 months per year or less) apply for this funding?

No.

11. Can this funding be used by summer programs to develop a full-year program?

No, although the program may apply in subsequent years after the full-year program is developed.

12. If children are receiving home-based technology assistance (UPSTART), can they still participate in a preschool program funded by HB96?

Yes. However, students who are enrolled in both will need to be tracked and that information disclosed to the external evaluator.

13. Would a private school with a preschool program apply to USOE or DWS?

Private providers apply through the Department of Workforce Services. A private provider on the campus of a public LEA would also apply to the Department of Workforce Services.

14. Can a program that includes a sliding tuition rate for some children, and also serves low-income students, apply for this funding?

Yes. School Districts and Charter Schools are not permitted to charge a parent copay in Title I funded programs. If Title I funding is not being used to fund a preschool program, schools can and often do charge a sliding fee scale copay. Children receiving childcare subsidies to attend preschool/daycare are typically charged a copay on a sliding fee scale, according to income level and eligibility.

313 (4) If permitted under Title 1 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 314 6301-6578, an LEA may charge a sliding scale fee to a student participating in a high quality 315 preschool program under this section, based on household income.

15. Do programs that serve a majority of special education students qualify for the funding?

This program is focused on serving general education, low-income students.

Data requirements

1. What kind of indicators are required to be in the longitudinal data?

The board will select an independent, nationally-recognized early childhood education evaluator, selected through a request for proposals process to annually evaluate performance outcome measures. The board will select a uniform assessment that:

- is a nationally norm-based measure of age-appropriate cognitive or language skills

- has established reliability and validity with other similar measures and with later school outcomes

Early childhood entities participating in the program must conduct ongoing program evaluation and data collection to monitor program goal achievement and implementation of required program components.

381 (6) The State Board of Education shall annually share with the board aggregated
382 longitudinal data on eligible students currently receiving funding under this section
and any
383 eligible students who previously received funding under this section, including:
384 (a) academic achievement outcomes;
385 (b) special education use; and
386 (c) English language learner services.

2. **Will students' academic performance be compared between programs to determine success, or will students be evaluated individually?**

Programs will not be evaluated in a comparative model.

3. **How will private providers create and assign SSIDs to students?**

Instructions for this procedure will be posted on the USOE/DWS information sites.

Allowable expenses

1. **Can a program pay for student enrollment with this program?**

No.

2. **Can students who are not designated low-income attend a preschool funded by this grant?**

Yes.

3. **Can the funding be used for advertising to recruit students?**

No.

4. **Can this program be used to fund education for teachers or paraprofessionals to earn their certification or degrees?**

While funding education is not specifically restricted, programs who choose to expend funds on education for staff should carefully consider the sustainability of that model.

5. **Can the assessment determined by the School Readiness Board be purchased with grant funding?**

Yes.

6. **Can the grant funds be used for the gap analysis required in the grant application?**

No. The gap analysis must be completed as a part of the grant application. Grant funds cannot be used to pay for a grant writer or any other work before the grant period begins.

7. Can a program hire a consultant to provide professional development with the grant funding?

Yes.

8. Can the funding be used pay for expansion?

No. Grant funds cannot be used to pay for student tuition, capital projects, or ongoing expenses such as rent.

Highly-qualified staff

1. Can a program have a highly-qualified teacher and a paraprofessional in a classroom to create the 20:1/10:1 ratio for students?

Yes. Each class must have one teacher who has obtained at least the minimum standard of qualification and one paraprofessional.

189 (e) for a preschool program run by an eligible LEA, a class size that does not exceed 20 190 students, with one adult for every 10 students in the class;

195 (h) for a preschool program run by an eligible LEA, each teacher having at least 196 obtained:

197 (i) the minimum standard of a child development associate certification; or

198 (ii) an associate or bachelor's degree in an early childhood education related field;

Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee

Goals, Research and Data

EDUCATION				
Early Childhood				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Commission Comments
Access to high-quality preschool	Some groundwork in Voice for Utah Children (VUC) report, Needs additional research	Early Childhood Statewide Data Integration Project-- working with DOH to get access to this data set, although it may not be complete and ready for use by the time we need it.	HB 96, Next Generation Kids (NGK, DWS Pilot)	USOE: not a written goal
Reduce chronic absenteeism in Intergenerational Poverty (IGP) students	Some groundwork in VUC report, Needs additional research	Utah Data Alliance (UDA) data sharing will allow us to assess whether IGP children show higher levels of absenteeism	SB 43, NGK	USOE: IS absenteeism a data point in UDA? DHS--JJS: Absenteeism may be a result of juvenile justice involvement, both child welfare and delinquency.
Increase IGP children scores on standardized tests	Some groundwork in VUC report, Needs additional research	UDA data sharing will allow us to assess whether IGP children show notable underperformance	SB 43, NGK, DWS STEM Pilot	USOE: Formative test may be more valuable than standardized test DHS--JJS: Data might be available form Youth in Custody programs at school distirct sites and JJS/provider facility sites.
Youth				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Commission Comments
Increase HS graduation or GED or Carnegie Certification	Evidence of support in the ed attainment of parents	UDA data sharing will allow us to assess whether IGP teens have lower graduation rates	SB 43, NGK, DWS STEM Pilot	USOE: Appropriate trade certifications (IT welding, medical assisting, etc) may be more valuable than a HS diploma; In addition to graduation rates, we may want to track course taking patters of IGP students. DHS--JJS: Data might be available from Youth in Custody programs at school district sites and JJS/provider facility sites.
Increase exploration of post-secondary options	Not yet researched	Utah Futures may allow for tracking of "exploration" in some of the post-secondary options, not all		USOE: work seeking skills may also be needed
Increase workforce experience	Not yet researched	DWS data, Workforce Investment Act program analysis	WIA Youth Programs	
Parent				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Commission Comments
Increase IGP parent completion of GED or Carnegie Certification	Supported by current report, but should scrutinize this goal*	DWS data from eligibility system	Ongoing	USOE: Employment may be more important than completion

Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee

Goals, Research and Data

HOME AND FAMILY				
Early Childhood				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Commission Comments
Increase availability of parenting education programs for IGP new and expectant families	Results from DCFS research support this goal	None? Would require a community resource assessment	NGK Pilot	
Increase availability of parenting education programs for IGP parents of toddlers	Results from DCFS research support this goal	None? Would require a community resource assessment	NGK Pilot	
Increase availability of parenting education programs for IGP parents of teens	Results from DCFS research support this goal	None? Would require a community resource assessment	NGK Pilot	
Youth				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Commission Comments
Advance and sustain evidence-based home visiting program w/in agencies working with IGP	What does evidence say about effective programs?	Some discussion regarding Strengthening Families Protective Framework (SFPF) home visiting program	Need to assess current home visiting at Commission Agencies	USOE: establish specific skills needed by youth for purposes of home vistingation
Reduce number of teen parents	Data in report	Birth Rate for IGP population, age 14-18: 42.3 Birth Rate Statewide, age 15-19: 23.3		USOE: worry about general health and safety of teen parents
Increase IGP completion of relationship or parenting workshop	Results from DCFS research support this goal	Some data in DWS?	DWS programs currently in place	
FOSTER CARE CHILDREN: Adopt child-based tracking system across school districts	Needs more research	Requires changes within USOE data tracking system		
Parent				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Commission Comments
Increase availability of parenting education programs for IGP parents of toddlers	Results from DCFS research support this goal	None? Would require a community resource assessment	NGK Pilot	
Evaluate barriers to marriage through Utah Marriage Commission	Research both supports and refutes this approach	Would require regression modeling to specifically show non-heteroskedastic correlations between marriage and poverty status (to justify this goal)		DHS--JJS: Discourage family a goal around marriage since we don't want to discourage individuals from leaving violent relationships; establish a goal around reducing incidence of domestic violence; include a goal related to providing family planning information.
Document evidence-based relationship, parenting, and financial literacy classes	This is not a goal, but instead a call for research to support other goals?			

Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee

Goals, Research and Data

Advance and sustain Strengthening Families Protective Framework (SFPF) w/in agencies working with IGP	Need to gather research that proves this program is optimal choice	Other agencies have adopted SFPF?	Need to assess current home visiting at Commission Agencies	USOE: increase parental involvement in school activities of children
---	--	-----------------------------------	---	---

Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee

Goals, Research and Data

HEALTH				
Early Childhood				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Department Comments
Increase utilization of Primary Care Provider	IGP access assessed in VUC report	Can track usage for those enrolled in Medicaid		
Increase access to mental health support	Mental Health services for children 0-5?	Can track usage for those enrolled in Medicaid	Department of Human Services (DHS) Early Intervention	DHS--DSAMH: Combine MH early intervention with School Based Behavioral mental health; Strengthen Early and Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Treatment screening tools for pediatricians which is a Medicaid/CHIP benefit
Expand nutrition education/use of school breakfast program	Some indirect evidence through current IGP report	UDA?	SNAP Partnering Efforts	USOE: Include other school/community based food programs; unsure if UDA collects this information DHS--JJS: This goal should include expansion to addressing hunger year round.
Youth				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Department Comments
Decrease number of youth engaged in risky behavior	No supporting research to date	Some study data may be available, but likely only addresses general population, not IGP	DWS STEM After School Pilot	USOE: attempt to eliminate specific types of risky behavior; Create Local Prevention coalitions to address local issues relating to environmental risk factors and increase environmental protective factors DHS--JJS: Utah Student Health and Risk Prevention provides data at school level; use free/reduced lunch rates to identify schools where IGP students are more prevalent. DHS--DSAMH: Universal, Selective and Indicated Prevention--comprehensive prevention services decrease risk factors and increase protective factors.
Increase number of IGP youth with health care coverage and Primary Care Provider	No supporting research to date	May be able to assess through DOH data for medicaid recipients		
Expand nutrition education/use of school breakfast program	Some indirect evidence through current IGP report	UDA?	SNAP Partnering Efforts	USOE: Include other school/community based food programs; UDA does not have this information DHS--JJS: This goal should include expansion to addressing hunger year round.
Parent				
Suggested Goal	Research Status	Data Status	Current Work	Department Comments
Increase utilization of Primary Care Provider, identify obstacles	IGP access assessed in VUC report	Can track usage for those enrolled in Medicaid		DHS--JJS: Recommend a goal related to improving access to prenatal care.

Intergenerational Poverty Advisory Committee

Goals, Research and Data

Increase access to mental health support	No supporting research to date	Can possibly track via DOH Medicaid data		USOE: stable housing? DHS--JJS: Family Resource Facilitators may have data on population served. DHS--DSAMH: Provide Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Treatment for all ages.
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--



STEM Skills Today  Workforce Tomorrow

Grant Announcement

May 1, 2014 – June 27, 2014

STEMLink is a collaborative partnership between:

- The Department of Workforce Services (DWS)
- The STEM Action Center
- The Utah State Board of Education (USOE)

The STEM Link Partnership will provide two separate grant opportunities to develop, implement, expand or enhance STEM skills and activities for students. These grants will focus on under-served youth and helping them to gain and apply STEM skills. These grant programs will target those students who need the most help in gaining employable skills that will help them achieve financial independence. In turn these students will catalyze economic growth within their communities. By serving the student, these grants will ultimately benefit communities and businesses.

The overarching goals for projects funded are to:

- Increase interest and excitement in STEM learning
- Increase STEM skills, understanding, knowledge and competency
- Increase awareness and interest in STEM education and career pathways
- When appropriate, provide students with industry recognized or stackable credentials

STEMLink In-School Grant Opportunity

This Grant will provide funding to public school districts, individual schools and charter schools to develop, implement or enhance STEM programs or STEM activities in the classroom for Elementary, Middle, Junior High and High School. This may include Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs and Work-Based Learning (WBL) activities that are STEM based. Total funding allocated for this grant is \$1,000,000. Funding limits are set by the STEMLink Executive Committee, but as a general guideline projects are limited to \$100,000. Grant period of performance: August 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015.

STEMLink After-School Grant Opportunity

This Grant will provide funding to public and private schools; local governments; public or private not-for-profit organizations; faith-based organizations; state offices and agencies; units of local governments; and Indian tribal governments. This grant is to develop, implement or enhance STEM programs or STEM activities after school, before school or summer programs for youth in Middle, Junior High and High school. This may include supplemental programming to the school day Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs and Work-Based Learning (WBL) activities that are STEM based. Total funding allocated for this grant is \$5,000,000. Funding limits are set by the STEMLink Executive Committee, but as a general guideline projects are limited to \$300,000. Grant period of performance: September 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017.

For more information, full program terms, and application details for the STEMLink grant programs please review the Request for Grants located at <http://jobs.utah.gov/edolr/rfp.html>.



INTERGENERATIONAL POVERTY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DWS Intergenerational Poverty Pilot Program

NEXT GENERATION KIDS

In response to S.B. 37 Intergenerational Poverty Provisions, the Department of Workforce Services is in the process of implementing a pilot program to reduce Intergenerational Welfare Dependency. Utah's Family Employment Program (FEP) has historically focused on employment goals.

Investing in both the child and parent is necessary to ensure that poverty does not continue from one generation to the next.

The **NEXT GENERATION KIDS** pilot will focus on the entire family, assisting parents with employment and intensive services that will benefit everyone.

The purpose of this program is to reduce the risk for children raised in welfare dependent households from being dependent on public assistance as adults.

Research has shown that children residing in families where the family received one or more months of financial assistance are at greater risk of being on financial assistance as an adult. To stop this progression, Next Generation Kids will target families with children 12 years and younger, who have received financial assistance through FEP anytime during the last twelve months.

A two-generation approach has been shown to be the most effective method and Next Gen Kids will involve a whole-family service provision. Individualized services will be offered to parents and children to eliminate barriers to work and health and address other facets of self-sufficiency.

We know that early intervention provides a strong foundation for children, which in turn promotes success in education and employment in adulthood. We expect a greater impact as we provide early opportunities for training, increasing families' options for improved income through employment.

DWS is utilizing the Implementation of Science strategies in collaboration with the University of Utah Social Research Institute. Human services agencies tend to move forward with program development prior to fully identifying bottlenecks that may impede effective implementation. By following the Implementation Science strategies, we increase the likelihood of achieving better outcomes over the long-term. We are engaging workgroups to explore data collection, identification of needs, evidence based interventions, appropriate staffing and marketing initiatives to ensure decisions made are well-integrated.

Immediately following the bidders meetings, interested applicants will submit letters of intent. Only applicants who meet this deadline will be considered for funding. The letter of intent requirement will allow the TCT to plan and develop the review committee and assess the level of need statewide to ensure equitable distribution of funding not only by area, but by service type.

The review period is set for three weeks including review committee orientation, reading time and post review committee meeting. Based on the results of the review committee, prospective awardees will be contacted to present on their proposal.

THE SCOPE OF WORK

Details of the scope of work are still being negotiated however it is proposed that it include a checklist of all possible services that are preferred for TANF funding. The list of services is still being developed, but would include services such as pregnancy prevention, youth mentoring, adult mentoring, fatherhood initiatives, financial responsibility (literacy), and pre-K/school readiness among others.

All applicants will be required to meet one or more of the four purposes of TANF :

- Provide assistance to needy families so that children can be cared for in their own homes
- Reduce the dependency of needy parents by promoting job preparation, work, and marriage
- Prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies
- Encourage the formation and maintenance of two parent families

They will also be required to determine eligibility for services meeting purposes 1 and 2. Because there are four purposes and many ways TANF funds can be used, it makes most sense to weigh service against service rather than program against program when scoring the proposals and awarding funding. This would allow for multiple services from multiple programs within a given area to be funded rather than a few programs that provide several services.

Applicants will be required to show outcomes for existing services and outline new outcome measures to be achieved if awarded the one time funding.



INTERGENERATIONAL POVERTY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CONTENTS

STEMLink Grant Announcement

DWS Intergenerational Poverty Pilot Program:
NEXT GENERATION KIDS

TANF RFG Summary

NEXTGENERATIONKIDS Strategies

1. Using an intensive team approach
 - a. Case Manager
 - b. Licensed Mental Health Therapist
 - c. Job Coach
2. Building relationships through team-engagement with customers
 - a. Team committed to family's progress
 - b. Relationship focused hand-on support of family participation
3. Meeting families where they live
 - a. Schools, community centers, residences, etc.
4. Promoting self-determination for families
5. Intensive training for team members on
 - a. Motivational interviewing
 - b. Cultural competency
 - c. Understanding human behavior
 - d. Understand the culture of poverty
 - e. Impacts of trauma
6. Building relationships with community partners and government agencies
7. Planning for economic success developed with case manager
8. Incentives for goals achieved

Initial Pilot Location-Implementation 9/1/2014

The **NEXTGENERATIONKIDS** pilot program will be implemented in the urban Ogden area, specifically zip code area 84401 with approximately 50 families. The first pilot location was selected based on cohort data from the Department's Intergenerational Poverty Report among the following other reasons:

1. The largest concentration of intergenerational welfare dependent families resides in this particular demographic.
2. The community is very passionate about decreasing the number of families in poverty and assisting parents and children in being more successful in education and employment.
3. United Way has designated this area as one of their Promise Neighborhoods is committed to helping families in poverty.
4. Ogden School District is very interested in partnering with DWS to assist in working with families to decrease poverty and increase education.
5. Ogden School District has offered space at James Madison Elementary School to house the pilot program.
6. James Madison Elementary also has a health clinic on site. Research also shows that a focus on health and nutrition are one of the most successful interventions when working with families in poverty.
7. Other local services are available for possible partnership as the program develops and expands.



INTERGENERATIONAL POVERTY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TANF RFG SUMMARY

May 8, 2014

TANF RFG STATUS

The total TANF RFG amount is \$30,000,000.00.

The TANF Contracts Team (TCT) is finalizing the scope of work and will post to the DWS grants page on June 9, 2014. Service Area Directors have been given TANF RFG messaging to share with interested community partners. Requests for private meetings to discuss TANF funding have been referred to Service Area Directors who will use the consistent messaging. Interested parties are asked to wait for the RFG to post and for bidders meetings to address questions.

TIMELINE

Tentative dates awaiting approval:

- The TANF RFG will post to the public on June 9, 2014
- The posting period will be June 9 – July 23, 2014
- The bidders meetings will take place June 18 – 27, 2014
- Letters of intent due July 2, 2014
- The review period is July 30 – August 26, 2014
- Prospective programs will give presentations during the week of September 8 – September 12, 2014
- Awards will be announced September 16, 2014

STRUCTURE

All contracts will be funded through reimbursement and we recommend they are contracted over a three year period. Grants will be used to enhance or supplement program services that currently serve needy families.

After the RFG is released, several bidders meetings will be held statewide. The TCT will work closely with and provide support to Service Area Directors as they facilitate the meetings in the community. This will allow the local areas to feel ownership of the process and communicate directly with their respective community partners. The TCT will coordinate with Service Area Directors to solidify dates, times, and locations.

MEMORANDUM

To: Casey Erickson
Carrie Mayne
From: Tracy S. Gruber
Date: May 19, 2014
Re: IGP: County Analysis

As requested, data has been analyzed to establish a list of potential communities in which additional intergenerational poverty pilot projects may be implemented.

The list was created by evaluating the following data: (1) county population as a share of state population; (2) concentration of intergenerational poverty adults within each county; (3) concentration of intergenerational poverty children within each county; and (4) concentration of public assistance children (“at-risk”) within each county. Those counties with higher concentrations of IGP populations relative to its share of state population are included in the priority list of counties. Once the counties were established, the cities with the largest populations within those counties are listed.

Note: Cities within Salt Lake County and Weber County are not listed since there are already pilots slated to start in those counties. Also note, Utah County has a high concentration of intergenerational poverty populations but represents an even greater share of state population. Further analysis can be done on Utah County but for purposes of this priority list, it has been excluded.

The priority list is provided on the following page. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Counties with High Concentrations of Intergenerational Poverty, Adults and Children

May 19, 2014

County & Major Cities	State Population	IGP Adults	IGP Kids	PA Kids (At-risk)	Annual Wag	Job Chang	Unemp. Rat
San Juan	0.5%	2.4%	2.7%	1.0%	\$ 36,794	0.9%	9.3%
Blanding (4,672)							
Duchesne	0.7%	1.0%	1.0%	0.6%	\$ 46,346	2.2%	3.5%
Duchesne (3,323)							
Sevier	0.7%	1.4%	1.5%	1.0%	\$ 31,110	-0.5%	5.2%
Richfield (8,692)							
Monroe (3,652)							
Carbon	0.8%	2.0%	1.8%	0.8%	\$ 37,899	-2.8%	5.9%
Price (13,612)							
Iron	1.7%	2.4%	2.4%	2.5%	\$ 28,472	1.0%	5.4%
Cedar City (20,961)							
Washington	5.0%	5.0%	6.2%	7.5%	\$ 30,474	5.2%	5.1%
St. George (74,901)							
Hurricane (14,838)							
Washington (18,756)							
Weber	8.3%	13.1%	12.4%	8.5%	\$ 36,337	3.1%	5.2%
Salt Lake	37.2%	38.9%	36.1%	34.1%	\$ 46,216	3.4%	4.2%

Source: Utah Department of Workforce Services. Population data is based on 2010 figures and provided by usa.com.

Resident County	Intergenerational PA Recipients				Non-Intergenerational	Compare Total
	Female	Male	Total	% of Total	Compare other PA	State Population
Beaver	51	27	78	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Box Elder	454	220	674	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%
Cache	703	397	1,100	3.1%	4.5%	4.1%
Carbon	447	275	722	2.0%	1.0%	0.8%
Daggett	5	4	9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Davis	1,829	936	2,765	7.7%	8.8%	11.1%
Duchesne	259	90	349	1.0%	0.5%	0.7%
Emery	107	62	169	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Garfield	26	23	49	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Grand	138	74	212	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%
Iron	516	327	843	2.4%	2.6%	1.7%
Juab	103	57	160	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
Kane	44	22	66	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Millard	113	69	182	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Morgan	20	10	30	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Piute	10	8	18	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Rich	5	3	8	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Salt Lake	8,952	4,993	13,945	38.9%	36.9%	37.2%
San Juan	518	339	857	2.4%	0.8%	0.5%
Sanpete	310	139	449	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%
Sevier	338	168	506	1.4%	0.9%	0.7%
Summit	46	23	69	0.2%	0.5%	1.3%
Tooele	557	311	868	2.4%	2.3%	2.1%
Uintah	408	116	524	1.5%	1.0%	1.2%
Utah	2,778	1,602	4,380	12.2%	17.7%	18.9%
Wasatch	86	36	122	0.3%	0.6%	0.9%
Washington	1,206	584	1,790	5.0%	6.4%	5.0%
Wayne	17	8	25	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Weber	3,092	1,603	4,695	13.1%	9.5%	8.3%
Undetermined	118	34	152	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%
Grand Total	23,256	12,560	35,816	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Non Intergeren					
Beaver	270	0.2%	256	16.81%	Summit
Box Elder	2004	1.8%	1992	19.96%	Morgan
Cache	5133	4.5%	5054	33.92%	Rich
Carbon	1114	1.0%	1080	40.41%	Wasatch
Daggett	16	0.0%	19	61.94%	Wayne
Davis	9943	8.8%	9927	62.32%	Daggett
Duchesne	594	0.5%	596	64.45%	Utah
Emery	403	0.4%	415	69.35%	Davis
Garfield	175	0.2%	175	71.27%	Cache
Grand	538	0.5%	514	72.83%	Kane
Iron	2913	2.5%	2856	76.47%	Garfield
Juab	386	0.4%	407	93.37%	Beaver
Kane	258	0.2%	264	95.00%	Piute
Millard	438	0.4%	446	97.36%	Washington
Morgan	162	0.2%	172	100.51%	Box Elder
Piute	69	0.1%	64	105.58%	Salt Lake
Rich	77	0.1%	80	109.75%	Millard
Salt Lake	41825	37.0%	41928	114.43%	Emery
San Juan	921	0.8%	851	115.54%	Tooele
Sanpete	1059	0.9%	1050	120.41%	Juab
Sevier	994	0.9%	976	123.04%	Sanpete
Summit	520	0.5%	541	129.07%	Uintah
Tooele	2617	2.3%	2561	138.66%	Iron
Uintah	1103	0.9%	1046	145.02%	Duchesne
Utah	19992	17.8%	20183	159.44%	Weber
Wasatch	637	0.6%	663	181.37%	Grand
Washington	7191	6.4%	7271	191.31%	Sevier
Wayne	96	0.1%	90	272.37%	Carbon
Weber	10705	9.3%	10545	451.73%	San Juan
Undetermi	1084	1.0%	1163	#DIV/0!	
	113237		113185		

Resident County	Intergenerational PA Recipients			Non-Intergenerational		Compare Total State Population
	Female	Male	Total	% of Total	Compare other PA	
Undetermined	118	34	152	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%
Daggett	5	4	9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Piute	10	8	18	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Rich	5	3	8	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Wayne	17	8	25	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Garfield	26	23	49	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Beaver	51	27	78	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Kane	44	22	66	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Grand	138	74	212	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%
Morgan	20	10	30	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Juab	103	57	160	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
Emery	107	62	169	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Millard	113	69	182	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
San Juan	518	339	857	2.4%	0.8%	0.5%
Duchesne	259	90	349	1.0%	0.5%	0.7%
Sevier	338	168	506	1.4%	0.9%	0.7%
Carbon	447	275	722	2.0%	1.0%	0.8%
Wasatch	86	36	122	0.3%	0.6%	0.9%
Sanpete	310	139	449	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%
Uintah	408	116	524	1.5%	1.0%	1.2%
Summit	46	23	69	0.2%	0.5%	1.3%
Iron	516	327	843	2.4%	2.6%	1.7%
Box Elder	454	220	674	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%
Tooele	557	311	868	2.4%	2.3%	2.1%
Cache	703	397	1,100	3.1%	4.5%	4.1%
Washington	1,206	584	1,790	5.0%	6.4%	5.0%
Weber	3,092	1,603	4,695	13.1%	9.5%	8.3%
Davis	1,829	936	2,765	7.7%	8.8%	11.1%
Utah	2,778	1,602	4,380	12.2%	17.7%	18.9%
Salt Lake	8,952	4,993	13,945	38.9%	36.9%	37.2%
Grand Total	23,256	12,560	35,816	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Resident County	Intergenerational PA Recipients				Non-Intergenerational	Compare Total State Population	IGP Kids	Non IGP Kids (PA)
	Female	Male	Total	% of Total	Compare other PA			
Undetermined	118	34	152	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.0%
Daggett	5	4	9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Piute	10	8	18	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Rich	5	3	8	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Wayne	17	8	25	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Garfield	26	23	49	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Beaver	51	27	78	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Kane	44	22	66	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%
Grand	138	74	212	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.3%
Morgan	20	10	30	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%
Juab	103	57	160	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Emery	107	62	169	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%
Millard	113	69	182	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.5%
San Juan	518	339	857	2.4%	0.8%	0.5%	2.7%	1.0%
Duchesne	259	90	349	1.0%	0.5%	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%
Sevier	338	168	506	1.4%	0.9%	0.7%	1.5%	1.0%
Carbon	447	275	722	2.0%	1.0%	0.8%	1.8%	0.8%
Wasatch	86	36	122	0.3%	0.6%	0.9%	0.4%	0.6%
Sanpete	310	139	449	1.3%	0.9%	1.0%	1.4%	1.1%
Uintah	408	116	524	1.5%	1.0%	1.2%	1.6%	1.1%
Summit	46	23	69	0.2%	0.5%	1.3%	0.2%	0.4%
Iron	516	327	843	2.4%	2.6%	1.7%	2.4%	2.5%
Box Elder	454	220	674	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%
Tooele	557	311	868	2.4%	2.3%	2.1%	2.6%	2.5%
Cache	703	397	1,100	3.1%	4.5%	4.1%	3.3%	4.7%
Washington	1,206	584	1,790	5.0%	6.4%	5.0%	6.2%	7.5%
Weber	3,092	1,603	4,695	13.1%	9.5%	8.3%	12.4%	8.5%
Davis	1,829	936	2,765	7.7%	8.8%	11.1%	8.0%	8.9%
Utah	2,778	1,602	4,380	12.2%	17.7%	18.9%	12.9%	19.2%
Salt Lake	8,952	4,993	13,945	38.9%	36.9%	37.2%	36.1%	34.1%
Grand Total	23,256	12,560	35,816	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Methodology: Counties were ranked by percentage of the state population. Then ranked further by the concentration of IGP kids and concentration of IGP adults. **Those counties that have a higher concentration of IGP children and IGP adults compared to their overall share of the state population are highlighted above.** Salt Lake County is also highlighted given the significant share of the IGP population residing there.

County & Major Cities	% State Population	%IGP Adults	% of IGP Kids	PA Kids (At-risk)	Annual Wage	Job Change	Unemp. Rate
San Juan Blanding (4,672)	0.5%	2.4%	2.7%	1.0%	\$ 36,794	0.9%	9.3%
Duchesne Duchesne (3,323)	0.7%	1.0%	1.0%	0.6%	\$ 46,346	2.2%	3.5%
Sevier Richfield (8,692) Monroe (3,652)	0.7%	1.4%	1.5%	1.0%	\$ 31,110	-0.5%	5.2%
Carbon Price (13,612)	0.8%	2.0%	1.8%	0.8%	\$ 37,899	-2.8%	5.9%
Iron Cedar City (20,961)	1.7%	2.4%	2.4%	2.5%	\$ 28,472	1.0%	5.4%
Washington St. George (74,901) Hurricane (14,838) Washington (18,756)	5.0%	5.0%	6.2%	7.5%	\$ 30,474	5.2%	5.1%
Weber Salt Lake	8.3% 37.2%	13.1% 38.9%	12.4% 36.1%	8.5% 34.1%	\$ 36,337 \$ 46,216	3.1% 3.4%	5.2% 4.2%

2013	Annual Wage	Job Change	Unemp. Rate
Beaver	\$ 33,984	11.0%	4.1%
Box Elder	\$ 34,077	4.4%	5.1%
Cache	\$ 30,992	1.7%	3.6%
Carbon	\$ 37,899	-2.8%	5.9%
Daggett	\$ 35,679	-1.0%	5.1%
Davis	\$ 39,090	2.5%	4.2%
Duchesne	\$ 46,346	2.2%	3.5%
Emery	\$ 43,179	1.9%	6.0%
Garfield	\$ 26,616	-2.4%	9.4%
Grand	\$ 29,106	1.3%	7.5%
Iron	\$ 28,472	1.0%	5.4%
Juab	\$ 33,200	6.2%	5.2%
Kane	\$ 28,803	1.8%	5.4%
Millard	\$ 38,223	1.7%	3.9%
Morgan	\$ 35,380	6.1%	3.9%
Piute	\$ 23,048	0.4%	5.0%
Rich	\$ 24,594	7.8%	3.5%
Salt Lake	\$ 46,216	3.4%	4.2%
San Juan	\$ 36,794	0.9%	9.3%
Sanpete	\$ 26,818	-0.7%	5.8%
Sevier	\$ 31,110	-0.5%	5.2%
Summit	\$ 36,517	3.2%	3.9%
Tooele	\$ 43,636	-2.4%	5.2%
Uintah	\$ 47,553	-2.3%	3.6%
Utah	\$ 37,209	5.5%	4.3%
Wasatch	\$ 32,648	7.6%	5.1%
Washington	\$ 30,474	5.2%	5.1%
Wayne	\$ 25,944	2.7%	11.8%
Weber	\$ 36,337	3.1%	5.2%
State	\$ 41,044	3.4%	4.4%

County & Zip Codes	City	Population	% State Population	%IGP Adults	% of IGP Ki PA Kids	
San Juan			0.5%	2.4%	2.7%	1.0%
	84510 Aneth	922				
	84511 Blanding	4,672				
	84512 Bluff	1,093				
	84530 La Sal	460				
	84531 Mexican Hat	642				
	84533 Lake Powell	267				
	84534 Montezuma Creek	2,654				
	84535 Montecello	2,601				
	84536 Monument Valley	1,454				
Duchesne			0.7%	1.0%	1.0%	0.6%
	84001 Altamont	725				
	84002 Altonah	302				
	84007 Bluebell	740				
	84021 Duchesne	3,323				
	84027 Fruitland	452				
	84031 Hanna	259				
	84051 Mountain Home	402				
	84053 Neola	1,115				
	84072 Tabiona	372				
	84073 Talmage	191				
Sevier			0.7%	1.4%	1.5%	1.0%
	84620 Aurora	1,151				
	84724 Elsinore	1,214				
	84652 Redmond	872				
	84730 Glenwood	268				
	84654 Salina	2,689				
	84739 Joseph	507				
	84657 Sigurd	505				
	84744 Koosharem	411				
	84701 Richfield	8,692				

84754 Monroe	3,652
84711 Annabella	735
84766 Sevier	147

Carbon		0.8%	2.0%	1.8%	0.8%
---------------	--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

84501 Price	13,612
84520 East Carbon	1,302
84526 Helper	4,134
84529 Kenilworth	180
84539 Sunnyside	379
84542 Wellington	1,806

Iron		1.7%	2.4%	2.4%	2.5%
-------------	--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

84714 Beryl	835
84760 Paragonah	559
84719 Brian Head	90
84761 Parawon	3,131
84721 Cedar City	20,961
84772 Summit	171
84742 Kanarraville	260
84753 Modena	26
84756 Newcastle	366

Washington		5.0%	5.0%	6.2%	7.5%
-------------------	--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

84722 Central	615
84746 Leeds	1,149
84771	
84783 Dammeron Valley	805
84725 Enterprise	1,964
84757 New Harmony	1,167
84774 Toquerville	1,399
84784 Hildale	2,745
84733 Gunlock	202
84763 Rockville	245

84779 Virgin	641				
84790 St. George	35,770				
84737 Hurricane	14,838				
84765 Santa Clara	6,143				
84780 Washington	18,756				
84791					
84738 Ivins	6,878				
84767 Springdale	679				
84781 Pine Valley	188				
84745 La Verkin	4,066				
84770 St. George	39,131				
84782 Veyo	794				
Weber		8.3%	13.1%	12.4%	8.5%
Salt Lake		37.2%	38.9%	36.1%	34.1%