

Racial Equity Assessment Lens (REAL)

NAME OF INITIATIVE PROGRAM/PROJECT	New or Existing?	Who is Conducting the Assessment?
Outside Agency Award Program (Human Services Nonprofit Funding Process)	Existing	Anne-Marie Vanaman - Carrboro Zequel Hall – Carrboro Jackie Thompson – Chapel Hill Rebecca Buzzard – Chapel Hill Sarah Vinas – Chapel Hill

While the ultimate beneficiaries of the Outside Agency Award Program are residents of the Towns and County, the nonprofit agencies who serve the residents also benefit from the program. Therefore, this assessment takes a two-pronged approach, looking at both the residents served, and the nonprofit agencies that receive funding. Some of the questions have been modified to accommodate this dual approach and to enhance the effectiveness of the lens on the award program.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The long-term consequences of slavery, Jim Crow, disenfranchisement, segregation, unjust lending practices, red lining and continued racial bias affect the ability for people of color to obtain equitable opportunities for education, employment, economic mobility, generational wealth, health care, and positive health outcomes.

Nonprofit programs and services have often been developed in response to the detrimental effects of racial inequities. Ideally, racial and social inequities are thoughtfully addressed in their programs and services. This demands an understanding of, and commitment to, racial equity from the program developers and service providers, as well as those who make funding decisions (elected officials), appointed officials, and the supporting local government staff.

This assessment will show how the Outside Agency Award Program was developed with intention to improve the education, economic, and health outcomes for Chapel Hill and Carrboro residents, particularly those who are low-income or otherwise disenfranchised.

It will also provide several key findings and a short list of recommendations that can be initially explored and could deepen the impact of the program on residents and nonprofits. These recommendations include: (1) increased funding, (2) greater diversity in leadership roles, (3) regular community needs assessments, (4) consistency in evaluation criteria; and (5) addressing program barriers and burdens.

INTRODUCTION – Outside Agency Award Program

The Chapel Hill Human Services Advisory Board (est. 1981) and the Town of Carrboro Human Services Advisory Commission (est. 1984) work cooperatively with Orange County to facilitate an application process for human service nonprofit agencies to request local government funding. The implementation and results of this process, the Outside Agency Award Program, will be explored in this racial equity assessment.

Local governments have statutory and constitutional authority to grant public funds only for projects, services, or activities that carry out a public purpose. (North Carolina General Assembly G.S. 160A-20.1 (municipalities) and G.S. 153A-449 (counties)). With this authority, the Towns and County can fund requests that support vital community services that address a broad range of community needs and issues disproportionately affecting individuals and families who are low-income.

Each jurisdiction includes funding for the Outside Agency Award Program in their respective adopted annual budgets, and once a year the Chapel Hill Board and the Carrboro Commission review proposals and invite applicants to present their applications in a joint public hearing. Afterward, the boards make funding recommendations to their respective Town Councils.

In 2018, the funding process was significantly refined to become more results oriented. The [Strategic Results Framework](#) was adopted by Chapel Hill and Carrboro and focuses on three main areas: Education, Livelihood Security/Safety Net Services, and Health.

While Orange County did not adopt the Towns' framework, the [BOCC Goals and Objectives](#), defined by the County's Board of County Commissioners, are in alignment. Orange County follows a different process, whereby the same applications are reviewed by County staff, who conduct meetings with the applicants one-on-one. The County Manager makes funding recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION & GOALS (Desired Results)

The following will specifically address: (1) who created the program; (2) what policies are relevant to the initiative; (3) who provides the program services; (4) why was the program created (who it serves); and (5) who makes the funding decisions.

1. WHO CREATED THE PROGRAM?

The elected officials of Chapel Hill and Carrboro established the Chapel Hill Human Services Advisory Board (1981) and the Town of Carrboro Human Services Advisory Commission (1984) to work cooperatively with Orange County to facilitate an application process to fund nonprofit requests that support vital community services.

The program's overarching goal is **to achieve economic and social wellbeing for all Chapel Hill and Carrboro residents, particularly those who are low-income or otherwise disenfranchised.** One way to work toward this goal is to financially support local nonprofits that provide vital services to community residents, services the Towns themselves do not provide.

Nonprofits are primarily dependent on public and private grants and donations to perform these services. (Some, such as health care agencies, also collect fees for service or receive Medicaid reimbursement.) Through the Outside Agency Award Program, the Towns and County provide a reliable, annual source of funding, creating more stability for the services that residents rely on. In the most recent grant cycle, a combined total of \$2.65M was awarded to the nonprofits by the local governments.

Over the years the Towns and County have revised the nonprofit funding application process to become more results-driven and to reduce the burden for the advisory boards, town staff, and applicants. In 2018, the Towns reviewed the existing program and gathered community input with the following intentions:

- Create a results-driven funding process that is responsive to the community's greatest needs.
- Ensure that nonprofits are serving marginalized communities.
- Establish clearly defined funding priority areas, goals, and outcome measures.
- Encourage a collaborative approach in meeting the community's needs.
- Support smaller non-profits in building capacity to serve more community members.
- Streamline and simplify the funding process.

The Chapel Hill Human Services Advisory Board and town staff held a series of focus groups that were part of a research and data collection process for a Community Needs Assessment. School Social Workers were also included to gain insight into and assess the needs in the Chapel Hill/Carrboro City School System for the purpose of developing the framework. A breakdown of age, gender, race, and ethnicity of the focus group participants is shown below.

Focus Group	# of Participants	Gender	Age	Race/Ethnicity	Years Lived in Chapel Hill
Inter-Faith Council Community House	10	Male	23- 72	Caucasian, African American, German/	3- 15
South Estes Public Housing Community	4	Female	25- 59	African American, Burmese	6- 59
CHCCS Social Workers	4	Female	48- 55	Caucasian	9- 25
Teens Boomerang Youth, Inc.	12	Mixed	12- 18	Caucasian, Asian, African American,	0- 20

Through this review of the program, and with results from the community needs assessment and nonprofit engagement, the Strategic Results Framework was developed. The Framework focused on three strategic objectives for the community:

- Strategic Objective 1: Children improve their education outcomes
- Strategic Objective 2: Residents increase their livelihood security
- Strategic Objective 3: Residents improve their health outcomes

*See Attachment 1 – Human Services Results Framework

The following changes were also made to the Outside Agency application and process:

- Created Intermediate Results, and Agency Performance Indicators
- Expanded demographic reporting
- Streamlined application (reduces burden on nonprofits)
- Revised scoring sheet/created rubric for application evaluation (Chapel Hill)
- Revised reporting template focused on results (grantees submit 2 reports annually)
- Capacity building training for Nonprofits

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Elected officials authorized the creation of the original program in the 1980s
- Focus groups of community residents and nonprofits informed a revised program framework in 2018
- Focus groups were formed with the intention to include diverse perspectives
- Advisory boards with Town staff developed the Strategic Results Framework
- Town Councils approved the Strategic Results Framework in 2018

2. WHAT POLICIES ARE RELEVANT TO THE INITIATIVE?

Federal Tax Code

Agencies must be 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organizations to receive Town funds.

To be tax-exempt under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, an entity must be organized and operated exclusively for exempt purposes set forth in section 501(c)(3), and none of its earnings may benefit any private shareholder or individual. In addition, it may not be an action organization, i.e., it may not attempt to influence legislation as a substantial part of its activities, and it may not participate in any campaign activity for or against political candidates.

State Constitution & General Statutes

Local governments have constitutional and statutory authority to grant funds to nonprofits for the benefit of the public. However, public officials “associated” with a nonprofit must recuse themselves from participating in the appropriation or administration of a contract.

Article V, Section 2(7) of the North Carolina Constitution: The General Assembly may enact laws whereby the State, any county, city or town, and any other public corporation may contract with and appropriate money to any person, association, or corporation for the accomplishment of public purposes only. (1969, c. 872, s. 1; c. 1200, s. 1; 2018-119, s. 1.)

Article V, Sect. 2(1) of the North Carolina Constitution: The General Assembly has authorized both counties and municipalities to “appropriate money to any person, association, or corporation” as long as the appropriations are used only to “carry out any public purpose that the [local governments are] authorized by law to engage in.” **G.S. 160A-20.1** (municipalities); **G.S. 153A-449** (counties).

G.S. 14-234.3 NC General Statute: Local public officials participating in contracts benefiting nonprofits with which associated. “No public official shall knowingly participate in making or administering a contract, including the award of money in the form of a grant, loan, or other appropriation, with any nonprofit with which that public official is associated. The public official shall record his or her recusal with the clerk to the board, and once recorded, the political subdivision of this State may enter into or administer the contract.”

Municipal Codes

The Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro created and appointed Advisory Boards/Commissions to review applications, hold public hearings and make funding recommendations to the Town Councils.

The Chapel Hill Human Services Advisory Board was created through ordinance to alert the Town Council to changes in human services needs in Chapel Hill, to assure that Chapel Hill citizens receive services to which they are entitled, coordinate delivery of human services with other agencies, advise the Town Council of human service funding needs, and other responsibilities as may be established by the Town Council. Chapel Hill Code of Ordinances.

The Carrboro Human Services Advisory Commission Studies all funding applications received by the town from non-departmental agencies and to make recommendations to the Carrboro Town Council on these funding requests. The Carrboro Town Council may establish a specific budget amount and direct that the total of all the commission's funding recommendations do not exceed this budgeted amount. Carrboro Town Code.

3. WHO PROVIDES THE PROGRAM SERVICES?

Nonprofit Agencies

The Towns contract with nonprofit agencies to provide human services to their residents. Ideally, racial and social inequities are thoughtfully addressed in the nonprofit programs and services. Nonprofits that primarily serve people of color should include people of color in leadership roles. Diversity and representation in leadership can improve decision-making, creativity, resiliency, and improve trust in the communities they serve. *See Appendix for links to research on nonprofit boards.

Nonprofit Leadership Demographic Data

Nonprofit Leadership Demographics	National CEOs	Orange County CEOs	National Boards of Directors	Orange County Boards of Directors
African American	5%	22%	6%	N/A
Asian or Pacific Islander	2%	-----	2%	N/A
Latinx	3%	-----	15%	N/A
Other	-----	4%	-----	N/A
White	87%	74%	78%	N/A

[National Source: Board Source, 2019] [Orange County Source: United Way of the Greater Triangle, 2018]

The Role of Nonprofits in the US

Human-service oriented nonprofits provide vital services to our communities and many nonprofits were created to address the disparities experienced by individuals and families who have been impacted by historical and structural racism. However, if we dig deeper, we can see that nonprofits themselves are part of a larger national system based on structural racism:

501c3 nonprofit status generally does not allow lobbying to address policy or political issues, it is a charitable designation to provide services, including serving unmet needs. This places nonprofits in the position of providing “band-aid” services, rather than solutions to systemic problems, making real progress difficult. In addition, grassroots nonprofits are reliant on donations which is precarious for the nonprofit and their services if donations decrease significantly.

Supporting nonprofits/charities/philanthropy (rather than creating an equitable tax system, higher wages or basic income, reparations, and systemic overhaul to include racial equity) are preferred by corporations and the wealthy, both of whom can receive tax, and other benefits for their contributions. Their economic power benefits the white power structure and influences policies, including federal and state tax codes, made by federal and state governments.

Furthermore, “charity” can create a power structure of giver and receiver, and often strips an individual’s sense of dignity, especially when the charity is a basic need or outcome everyone has a right to.

This context is important when reviewing the human services process. However, many residents in Orange County rely on these services for vital human needs, and while systemic change is certainly called for, it cannot be accomplished on a local level in isolation of other systemic reformations. Without these nonprofit organizations, many in our community would be left without basic necessities such as food, shelter, childcare, and healthcare.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- BIPOC are under-represented in nonprofit leadership, locally and nationally
- Nonprofit leadership data is sparse at the local level
- Nonprofits exist within a national framework based on structural racism
- Nonprofits provide services that aim to mitigate the consequences of structural racism (band-aid solutions to systemic problems)

4. WHY WAS THIS PROGRAM CREATED?

The Human Services funding process was created to provide the Towns with an equitable funding process to meet identified community needs. Nonprofit programs and services have often been developed in response to the detrimental effects of racial inequities. There is a large amount of data and research regarding racial disparities across the topics/issues. A few data points for each Strategic Objective of the Chapel Hill/Carrboro Outside Agency Program are provided below.

Topic/Issue	Baseline Data and Racial Disparities	Historical Root Causes of Disparities												
Ex: Instead of education list attendance, school discipline, and commutes.	What does available data or research say about this issue? What disparities already exist within this issue?	What caused the numbers to look like they do today? Were the causes in the distant past and/or more recent? Were they purposeful or unintentional?												
<p>Strategic Objective 1: Children improve their education outcomes</p> <p>Intermediate Result 1.1 Children Birth-to-K access early childhood development opportunities</p> <p>Intermediate result 1.2 Children demonstrate new grade-level appropriate skills</p> <p>Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Lack of Administrative Diversity ▫ Biased School Discipline ▫ Unequal Access to Resources 	<p>Administrative Diversity [Source: The Education Trust]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ 11 school districts in the state have no Latino teachers in their schools and eight have no Black teachers. One district has no teachers of color at all. ▫ “Well over a half-century after Brown, black teachers make up a miniscule fraction of the teaching force, which has negatively impacted many black students in terms of test scores and graduation rates.” [Source: The impact of desegregation on black teachers in the metropolis, 1970–2000] ▫ In CHCCS, non-white students make up 50% of the student body while only 30% of the teachers identify as a race other than white. <table border="1" data-bbox="521 1203 964 1367"> <thead> <tr> <th>CHCCS Demographics</th> <th>Student</th> <th>Teacher</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>African American</td> <td>11%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>39%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>50%</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: CHCCS Schools RE Report Card 2019-20</p> <p>School Discipline [Sources: Data Snapshot: 2017 - 2018, National Data on School Discipline by Race and Gender, Decades after CHCCS desegregation, data shows racial disparities persist - The Daily Tar Heel]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Girls of color are at a far higher risk of discipline in schools — even more so than boys of color. Compared to white girls, black girls had: 4.19X the risk of receiving out-of-school suspension and 3.99X the risk of expulsion. ▫ Black girls and boys have higher suspension rates, expulsion rates, transfer rates, rate of restraints, referral rates, and arrests relative to white girls and boys across K-12 U.S. Public Schools. ▫ In CHCCS school, “For nine of the 10 schools that reported short-term suspension rates for white and Black students, Black students were at least 11 	CHCCS Demographics	Student	Teacher	African American	11%	15%	Other	39%	15%	White	50%	80%	<p>Lack of Administrative Diversity Brown v. Board of Education - 1954</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ While desegregation of the student body was mandated, laws did not protect the jobs of black teachers and administrators. ▫ Intentional racially discriminatory hiring practices erupted after the ruling. <p>Biased School Discipline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Faculty and administration bias in determining which students are suspected of, or blamed for, rule breaking, as well as viewing African American children as older than they are, results in higher suspension rates for African American children and teens.
CHCCS Demographics	Student	Teacher												
African American	11%	15%												
Other	39%	15%												
White	50%	80%												

times more likely to be suspended than white students.... Chapel Hill High School had the largest disparity, with Black students being 43.5 times more likely to be suspended than white students.”

CHCCS Student Demographics	% Of Population	% Of Suspensions
African American	10.9%	35.2%
Asian	13.9%	3.7%
Indigenous	0.2%	1.7%
Latinx	17.3%	25.1%
Multi-Racial	7.3%	10.1%
White	50.4%	24.2%

Source: [CHCCS Schools RE Report Card 2019-20](#)

Access to Resources [Source: [State of the Community Data 2021](#), [Book Deserts: The Consequences of Income Segregation on Children’s Access to Print](#), [Racial Disparities in Early Childhood Ed Hurts U.S. – BlackPressUSA](#)]

- One-in-three toddlers of color lives in poverty. By 5 years old, children from low-income homes have heard millions fewer words than their more affluent peers, a vocabulary deficit known as the word gap.
- 18% of African American & 11% of Hispanic Households lack a computer or internet access in Carrboro and Chapel Hill.
- Number of white students scoring “Grade Level Proficient” on the 3rd grade level widened between the number of African American students on the same EOG in CHCCS.
- In CHCCS, 62% of African American and 63% of Hispanic students scored below the achievement standard for reading performance and will likely need additional help in the next year to succeed in that subject area.
- During the 2020-2021 school year, 78% of White 3rd-graders read on grade level across the CHCCS school district (as measured by the demonstration of proficiency on the EOG Reading Grade 3 test). Meanwhile, 34% of Hispanic 3rd-graders and 30% of Black 3rd-graders read on grade level across the CHCCS school district.
- During SY2019, 57% of Black students demonstrated “Grade Level Proficiency” on the Grade 3 Reading EOG across the CHCCS district. During SY2021, this figure dropped to 30%.

Unequal Access to Resources [Source: [Book deserts leave low-income neighborhoods thirsty for reading material \(nbcnews.com\)](#), [Access Denied: Economics and the Elite - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](#)]

Resource disparities are a result of intentional housing policies and employment discrimination, affecting hiring practices and access to education.

- “Book deserts exist when there is a rise in income segregation. This negatively impacts a family’s capability to provide reading material for their children and that ultimately affects a child’s chances to succeed academically.”
- In 1946, the Truman Commission on Higher Education described the country's failure "to provide a reasonable equality of educational opportunity for its youth."
- “Although digital devices have opened up new opportunities for book reading, there is evidence that access to the Internet is uneven.”

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **The roots of these disparities are in slavery, segregation, and then racism in educational systems.**
- **Students of all backgrounds miss out on the many academic and social-emotional benefits of a racially and ethnically diverse teacher workforce.** [Source: [The Education Trust](#)]
- **The race and background of teachers “influence children’s attitudes toward school, their views of their own and others intrinsic worth.”** [Source: [Training and Recruiting Minority Teachers; 1986 Carnegie Report](#)]

- Exclusionary discipline “is strongly associated with a host of negative outcomes affecting student wellness, including increased disengagement, feelings of stress and isolation, poorer academic achievement, and increased likelihood of involvement with juvenile justice systems. [Source: [Data Snapshot: 2017 - 2018. National Data on School Discipline by Race and Gender](#)]
- African American students are 3x more likely to face disciplinary action.
- The absence or scarcity of books impact how a child's early literacy and language skills develop.
- Lower-income families, especially in more densely populated areas, may struggle to supplement their child’s early development due to a limited access to books in their respective communities. Many low- and moderate-income families remain under-connected, with mobile-only access and inconsistent connectivity. [Source: [Book Deserts: The Consequences of Income Segregation on Children’s Access to Print](#)]
- Access to early childhood education (Head Start) improves educational outcomes, increasing the probability that participants graduate from high school, attend college, and receive a post-secondary degree, license, or certification. [Source: [The Long-Term Impact of the Head Start Program](#)]

Topic/Issue	Baseline Data/Existing Disparities	Root Causes
<p>Strategic Objective 2: Residents increase their livelihoods security</p> <p>Intermediate Result 2.1 Residents access the most appropriate social safety net services</p> <p>Intermediate result 2.2 Residents increase job skills appropriate for the local economy</p> <p>Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Poverty ▫ Housing Insecurity ▫ Food Insecurity 	<p>National [Source: Poverty Rates for Blacks and Hispanics Reached Historic Lows in 2019 (census.gov)]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ In 2019, Blacks represented 13.2% of the total population in the United States, but 23.8% of the poverty population. Hispanics comprised 18.7% of the total population, but 28.1% of the population in poverty. <p>Local [Source: US Census Quick Facts]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ In Orange County, Blacks represent 11.9% of the population, but 19.6% of the poverty population. Hispanics comprise 8.8% of the total population, but 13.9% of the population in poverty. ▫ In Carrboro, Blacks represent 16.1% of the population, but 16.3% of the poverty population. Hispanics comprise 6.6% of the total population, but 22.1% of the population in poverty. ▫ In Chapel Hill, Blacks represent 10.2% of the population, but 28.1% of the poverty population. Hispanics comprised 7.2% of the total population, but 12.6% of the population in poverty. ▫ Overall, 14.1% of Carrboro residents and 18.5% of Chapel Hill residents are living in poverty. <p>Poverty [Sources: Poverty in the United States: 50-Year Trends and Safety Net Impacts, OCPEH 2021 Annual Report, Carrboro Affordable Housing Issues & Opportunities, Labor force characteristics by race and ethnicity, 2020: BLS Reports: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ “The unemployment rate has historically been twice as high for Blacks as for Whites. Among Hispanics, the unemployment rate also typically outpaces the national average.” 	<p>Poverty [Sources: Poverty in the United States: 50-Year Trends and Safety Net Impacts, Economic Inequality and Poverty in the United States – Introduction to Sociology: Understanding and Changing the Social World (howardcc.edu)]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ U.S. poverty stems from problems in American society that lead to lack of equal opportunity. These problems include racial, ethnic, gender, and age discrimination; lack of access to educational opportunities and

- Since 2008, median household income for Blacks has grown at a slower rate than median household income for Hispanics.
- OC Point-in-Time (PIT) count from 2017 to 2021 increased 39% for the overall number of individuals experiencing homelessness and Chronic Homelessness increased 170%.
- While black or African American represent 12% of the overall population in Orange County, they represent 67% of people experiencing homelessness.
- Black/African Americans comprise 19% of the population that the NC Coalition to End Homelessness serves across the State, yet 37% of everyone experiencing Homelessness (1.95x the rate of the general population).
- In Carrboro, 19% of Hispanic households and 21% of Black households experience severe cost burden.
- In 2020, the national overall unemployment rate averaged 8.1%. However, when looking at the unemployment rates by race, rates were higher for American Indians and Alaska Natives (11.7 percent), people categorized as being of Two or More Races (11.6 percent), and Blacks or African Americans (11.4 percent). The rate for people of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, at 10.4 percent, was higher than the rate of 7.5 percent for non-Hispanics.
- Among the major race and ethnicity groups, Hispanics and Blacks continued to have considerably lower earnings than Whites and Asians. The median usual weekly earnings of full-time wage and salary workers in 2020 were \$758 for Hispanics, \$794 for Blacks, \$1,003 for Whites, and \$1,310 for Asians.

Housing [Sources: [Data USA: Orange County, Carrboro Comprehensive Plan - Affordable Housing, Chapel Hill Housing Needs & Market Assessment, Affordable Housing Summit Report, Orange County](#)]

- In 2019, the median property value in Orange County, NC grew to \$308,800 from the previous year's value of \$292,500.
- For-sale housing prices are escalating rapidly to a current market price of \$348,000.
- The percentage of owner-occupied in Carrboro is 42.6% and Chapel Hill is 51.8%, lower than the national average of 64.1% [2019].
- More than 40% of Orange County households are eligible for income-based affordable housing, while only 3% of the total units in the county are permanently affordable. The need

- adequate health care; and structural changes in the American economic system.
- During the Depression, the government did not provide any unemployment insurance, so people who lost jobs easily became impoverished.
- Poverty among all racial and ethnic groups increased the most between the late 1970s and the early 1980s, coinciding in part with the deep recessions in 1980's. Income distribution policies favored the rich and hurt the economic standing of the middle class and the poor. The 2007 Great Recession helped to increase poverty levels again.

Housing [Sources: [How Redlining's Racist Effects Lasted for Decades - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](#), [Exclusionary Zoning: Its Effect on Racial Discrimination in the Housing Market - The White House](#)]

- Redlining: practice of outlining areas on maps that are "safe" for insuring mortgages. Those outlined in red, which typically contained many Black residents, were not approved for loans.
- Over-valuation and over-taxation: white tax assessors would overvalue Black-owned land, increasing their tax burden and slowly draining their savings. Tax delinquency laws would be manipulated to deprive Black people of their land. Today, it is common for

	<p>for affordable housing has continued to grow over the last 10 years, with lower-income households continuing to be priced out of the market.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ In Carrboro, rent is rising faster than income. Rent on a two-bedroom apartment has increased 29% over four years while median household income rose 11%. ▫ In Chapel Hill, average apartment rents are affordable to households earning 80% of AMI or above but are unaffordable to households at lower income levels. ▫ "...market rents have increased nine times faster than AMI at 4.6% annually for the past 5 years, and the median home sales price has increased four times faster than AMI, at an annual rate of 2.1% since 2000." <p>Food [Sources: State of the Community Data Book 2021, NPR – Food Insecurity In The U.S. By The Numbers, Table NC feeding local kids]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Orange County Food and Nutrition Services Participants Increased by 2,600 Since Jan 2020. ▫ 19.1% of Black households and 15.6% of Hispanic households experienced food insecurity in 2019. ▫ 1 in 3 kids in Orange County are living with food insecurity. ▫ Although levels of food insecurity have declined and risen over the past 20 years, one trend that has continued to persist is the gap in the prevalence of food insecurity between people of color and white people. 	<p>Black-owned homes to be undervalued upon appraisal for sale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Race-restricted covenants: legally enforceable "contract" imposed on a deed meant to prohibit the sale of real property to people of color. ▫ Subprime mortgage lending: in the lead-up to the 2008 Housing Bubble, by 2006, Black mortgage recipients had subprime rates three times as high as white recipients. ▫ Racial Zoning: practice of using zoning to segregate neighborhoods into Black and white areas. ▫ "Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) units are at risk. They are being redeveloped to serve high-end rental and ownership markets, including student housing. Affordable housing units added to the housing stock each year are not keeping pace with the disappearance of NOAH." <p>Food [Source: USDA ERS - Access to Affordable, Nutritious Food Is Limited in "Food Deserts"]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Spatial disparities in access to stores selling nutritious foods. ▫ Employment—both being unemployed and being employed but in a low-wage job—is also a strong factor in whether a household is food insecure. ▫ Location – Individuals in neighborhoods that lack grocery stores and have limited access to transportation, are often left with easy access only to fast food restaurants and convenience stores "food deserts."
--	---	---

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- African Americans and Hispanics continue to be over-represented in the population in poverty relative to their representation in the overall population and consistently experience crisis-level rates of poverty and food insecurity.
- Black and Hispanic populations face disproportionately high housing cost burdens, indicating that race and ethnicity remain significant predictors of those facing housing insecurity.

Topic/Issue	Baseline Data/Existing Disparities	Root Causes
<p>Strategic Objective 3: Residents improve their health outcomes</p> <p>Intermediate Result 3.1 Residents access basic healthcare services (primary, behavioral, dental)</p>	<p>Access to Healthcare [Source: 2019 Orange County Community Health Assessment, Data USA: Orange County, NC's Racial Gap in Infant Deaths - NC Child, Mental and Behavioral Health - African Americans - The Office of Minority Health (hhs.gov)]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ African Americans experience a higher burden of cancer having the highest death rate, and the lowest survival rate than any racial or ethnic group. 	<p>Access to Healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Health disparities are embedded in structural racism and income inequality that contribute to the lack of resources and distribution of resources to accommodate the population that is in need. Additional factors that contribute to disparities in healthcare include:

<p>Intermediate result 3.2 Residents demonstrate new healthy lifestyle behaviors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ In 2019, the rate of Black infant deaths was 2.66 times the rate for white infants, one of the widest disparities ever recorded in North Carolina. Barriers to affordable and consistent healthcare for women pre- and post-conception contributed to high rates of fetal and infant death, despite advances in clinical care. ▫ In NC, barriers to affordable and consistent healthcare for women pre- and post-conception contribute to high rates of fetal and infant death each year, despite advances in clinical care. ▫ While Orange County is rich in resources, 12.8% of the population lives in poverty, with 6.2% of all families living below the poverty level. (2017) ▫ Low-income and predominately minority communities in Orange County reported problems accessing healthcare due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Wait at health care facilities was too long ◆ Unaffordable deductible/co-pay ◆ Insurance did not cover healthcare need ▫ In 2019, suicide was the second leading cause of death for blacks or African Americans, ages 15 to 24. Black females, grades 9-12, were 60 percent more likely to attempt suicide, as compared to non-Hispanic white females of the same age. ▫ The census tract with the highest concentration of uninsured individuals revealed: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Poverty/Unemployment ◆ Environmental threats ◆ Lack of access to healthcare ◆ Unequal access to healthcare facilities ◆ Educational inequity ◆ Language Barrier, Immigration Status ◆ Bias in healthcare providers ▫ The government controls the distribution of healthcare services and resources and the General Assembly has repeatedly rejected federal aid to expand Medicaid. ▫ Racism contributes to unequal access to resources and services, including mental health care. 																		
<p>Topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Equity in access to Healthcare 	<table border="1" data-bbox="456 1213 959 1402"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Chapel Hill</u> Census Tract</th> <th><u>Carrboro</u> Census Tract</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Uninsured by Race/Ethnicity</td> <td>119.03</td> <td>107.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>African American</td> <td>-----</td> <td>38.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Asian</td> <td>3%</td> <td>10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>White</td> <td>1.6%</td> <td>6.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hispanic/Latinx</td> <td>42.9%</td> <td>20.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;">Source: Carrboro Living Atlas</p>		<u>Chapel Hill</u> Census Tract	<u>Carrboro</u> Census Tract	Uninsured by Race/Ethnicity	119.03	107.07	African American	-----	38.1%	Asian	3%	10.2%	White	1.6%	6.6%	Hispanic/Latinx	42.9%	20.4%	
	<u>Chapel Hill</u> Census Tract	<u>Carrboro</u> Census Tract																		
Uninsured by Race/Ethnicity	119.03	107.07																		
African American	-----	38.1%																		
Asian	3%	10.2%																		
White	1.6%	6.6%																		
Hispanic/Latinx	42.9%	20.4%																		

<p>KEY TAKEAWAYS</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Discrimination and structural racism in healthcare are key contributors to inequity in health behaviors and outcomes. ➤ Race and ethnicity remain significant predictors of the quality of health care received and BIPOC households are less likely to receive routine medical care and face higher rates of morbidity and mortality than non-minorities.

What is the specific desired result of this initiative to address the disparities?

Overall: To achieve economic and social wellbeing and opportunities to thrive for all Chapel Hill and Carrboro residents, particularly those who are low-income or otherwise disenfranchised.

The desired results below seek to address existing disparities and eliminate outcomes based on an individual’s gender, race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic backgrounds.

Strategic Objective 1: Children improve their education outcomes

Desired Result Statement: All children improve their education outcomes through this initiative’s support of nonprofit agency programs that provide access to early childhood development opportunities and help children exhibit new grade-level appropriate skills that afford them the opportunity to be "College and Career Ready."

Strategic Objective 2: Residents increase their livelihoods security

Desired Result Statement: Low-income or disenfranchised residents increase their livelihood security through this initiative’s support of programs that address food and housing insecurities by providing social safety net services and programs that increase job skills.

Strategic Objective 3: Residents improve their health outcomes

Desired Result Statement: Residents improve their health outcomes by having greater access to, and higher quality, healthcare.

5. WHO MAKES THE FUNDING DECISIONS?

Town Councils, Boards and Commissions

The Chapel Hill Human Services Advisory Board consist of 7 Chapel Hill residents appointed by the Chapel Hill Town Council.

The Carrboro Human Services Advisory Commission consists of 7 Carrboro residents appointed by the Carrboro Town Council.

Describe the demographics of the decision makers; compare the demographics of the decision makers to Carrboro & Chapel Hill residents.

[Source: 2019 Census Data – American Community Survey, Data USA]

Carrboro				
Race/Ethnicity	Residents	Town Council	All Boards / Commissions	Human Services
African American	16.1%	14.3%	24%	14.3%
Asian	7.3%	-----	3.8%	-----
American Indian/ Alaska Native		-----	1%	-----
Multi-Racial/Other	4.8%	14.3%	2.9%	14.3%
White	69.2%	71.4%	64.4%	71.4%
Not Indicated		-----	3.8%	-----
Ethnicity				
Hispanic/Latinx	6.6%	14.3%	2.9%	14.3%
Non-Hispanic/Latinx		85.7%	17.3%	28.6%
Not Indicated		-----	79.8%	57.1%

Chapel Hill				
Race/Ethnicity	Residents	Town Council	All Boards / Commissions	Human Services
African American	10.2%	11%	10.5%	14.3%
Asian	13.5%	-----	5.6%	14.3%
American Indian/ Alaska Native		-----	1.6%	-----
Multi-Racial/Other	3.7%	11%	1.6%	-----
White	71.3%	56%	75%	71.4%
Not Indicated		22%	5.6%	-----
Ethnicity				
Hispanic/Latinx	7.2%		2.6%	3.3%
Non-Hispanic/Latinx			75.2%	96.7%
Not Indicated			22.2%	-----

Although the makeup of the boards reflects the community, it does not reflect the population that is being served (to the extent that we can identify).

Race Served by Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health
African American	30%	13%	28%
Amer. Indian / Alaskan Native	1%	0.3%	0.1%
Asian	23%	7%	7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	2%	0.2%	3%
Other Race	16%	11%	8%
White	27%	12%	27%
Unknown	0.1%	57%	28%
Ethnicity Served by Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health

Hispanic/Latinx	23%	11%	28%
Non-Hispanic Latinx	77%	42%	39%
Unknown	0.04%	47%	33%

The Towns and County have a focus on increasing the diversity of residents serving on advisory boards so that they are more representative of the experiences of all community residents and that advisory board recommendations are inclusive of these experiences and perspectives.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- BIPOC are under-represented in nonprofit leadership, locally and nationally
- Nonprofit leadership data is sparse at the local level
- The makeup of the decision makers reflects the community, it does not reflect the population that is being served (to the extent that we can identify)

For the purpose of this assessment, we are providing data from FY19-20, which is a more accurate representation of this funding process. Due to the pandemic, FY21 and FY22 may not show a true representation of the nonprofit's programs and services. Also note, that not all organizations are able to collect demographic information on their participants.

Funded Initiatives	BENEFITTED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	BURDENED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS
	<p><u>Residents</u></p> <p><u>Strategic Objective 1: Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ 18 nonprofit programs served 10,424 individuals and 82.43% were served in Chapel Hill and Carrboro through this initiative. ▫ Of the total served: 70% were youth (age 6-18), 50% male, 30.43% African American and 22.71% Hispanic. <p><u>Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ 29 nonprofit programs served, 39,895 individuals, and 37.31% were served in Chapel Hill and Carrboro through this initiative. ▫ Of the total served: 22.5% were adults (age 19-50), 13% African American, and 11% Hispanic. <p><u>Strategic Objective 3: Health</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ 24 nonprofit programs served 34,954 individuals and 42.13% were served in Chapel Hill and Carrboro through this initiative. ▫ Of the total served: 32% were youth (age 6-18), 28% African American, and 28% Hispanic. <p>*For a more comprehensive look at the individuals served, please see tables in the Appendix.</p>	<p><u>Residents</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Some programs are geared towards a specific group of people; therefore, funding may not serve other groups or the community as a whole. ▫ For example: some programs are geared towards helping individuals find employment, but funding could also benefit individuals who are employed but wish to gain higher skills so they can find better employment. ▫ People that fall outside of the income limits but still need assistance.
	<p><u>Nonprofit agencies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Receive funding to support services or programs. ▫ Have a reliable, annual funding opportunity through this program. 	<p><u>Nonprofit agencies</u></p> <p><u>Application Requirements</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Applying can be time consuming for a small nonprofit.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Hearing process allows the agencies to interact with the Human Services Commissions and provide information not captured in the application. ▫ Town staff assist agencies one-one, in workshops and Q&A sessions. ▫ Town staff and agencies develop working relationships. ▫ Application is now streamlined and electronic. ▫ For new agencies, local government funding can open the door to larger state and federal funding. ▫ Town staff connects agencies who may have complementary services or needs. ▫ Program eliminates Town Council's burden of reviewing 45-50 funding requests and the public hearings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ To be eligible, nonprofits must provide certain federal and state designations, financial documents, and insurance requirements. ▫ Nonprofit's program may not fall within the strategic objectives; therefore, they cannot be funded. ▫ Small nonprofits may have difficulty with the eligibility requirements due to lack of experience and/or funds. ▫ Application and agency reports are both due in January, this may create a barrier for nonprofits that have limited staff and reporting capacity. <p><u>Hearings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Hearings are time consuming and may be held at an inconvenient time for agencies (6pm-9pm). ▫ The hearings can be intimidating for some. <p><u>Reporting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Data – many nonprofits do not have the resources to provide the level of demographic data required in the application and reports. Or the nature of their work, such as an anonymous help line, make the collecting data impossible. ▫ Semi-annual reports and reimbursement requests, rather than receiving funding upfront, can be difficult for agencies with less capacity. ▫ Final agency reports run concurrent with fiscal year closeouts. <p><u>Funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Towns have inadequate funding to meet the full requests; small awards may not be worth the effort of applying or have a significant impact. ▫ Nonprofit capacity is not equitable; some have existed for decades and have a solid donor base; others are very vulnerable if cuts in funding are made.
<u>Funded Initiatives</u>	BENEFITTED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	BURDENED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS
	<p><u>Advisory Boards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Creates the opportunity to serve the community and participate in local government. ▫ Make funding recommendations. ▫ Learn about programs and community need. ▫ Hearings are held at times convenient to the boards/commissions (for members who work 9-5 jobs). ▫ Currently exploring hybrid / virtual meetings to mitigate the impacts on the environment and ongoing pandemic. 	<p><u>Advisory Boards</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Reviewing applications and conducting public hearings is very time consuming. ▫ Making recommendations when the budgeted funding is inadequate is very difficult. ▫ Hearings are held at times inconvenient to the boards/commissions (members who do not work 9-5 jobs).
<u>Funded Initiatives</u>	BENEFITTED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	BURDENED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS
	<p><u>Town staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Town staff and agencies develop working relationships which benefit the community. 	<p><u>Town staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Program requires significant time and attention to detail ▫ Hearings are held at an inconvenient time

Non-Funded initiatives		
<u>Non-Funded</u> Initiatives	BENEFITTED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS	BURDENED INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS
If the existing initiative is no longer funded	Other local government programs would benefit from increased funding.	The success of the Towns is determined by the health and well-being of its citizens; therefore, Chapel Hill and Carrboro residents, particularly those who are low-income or otherwise disenfranchised and do not have access to public benefits would be burdened if this initiative is not funded. Nonprofit agencies would be burdened with replacing this funding source and may not be able to offer a wide range of services.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Benefits

- Nonprofits have a local government funding program that is responsive to feedback through annual surveys
- Can open the door to additional funding resources
- Fosters town-nonprofit relationships
- Community members make funding recommendations
- Program removes the burden of application review from the Town Council

Burdens & Barriers

- Time-consuming for staff, advisory boards, nonprofits
- Hearings held at inconvenient times for many
- Reporting requirements can be burdensome for some nonprofits
- Funding budget is inadequate to meet the need

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

List the individuals or groups who will potentially benefit the most or be burdened the most by this

Already Involved

Residents often contact the Towns seeking assistance and services that the Towns do not provide. The Human Services funding program was created as a way to support the nonprofit agencies who develop and provide those vital services and programs for residents.

We do not survey the program participants directly; information is gathered from the nonprofits to gauge effectiveness of their programs in the form of semi-annual reports on performance and data which helps to inform funding decisions and highlights changes in community need. The Towns also stay abreast of issues facing the community through direct involvement with residents and in collaboration with nonprofits on several coalitions.

Community Members	<p>The Towns often engage with the public and nonprofits to connect people to resources, work collaboratively with agencies to assist residents, and to gather information that will inform Town’s goals and funding focus. The following are a couple of ways the Towns have received input and engaged communities in 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <u>Community Surveys</u>: Every other year the Towns survey residents for their opinions on the community and Town services. Resident priorities and concerns inform the goals and work of the housing and community services departments at both towns. ▫ <u>ARPA Interviews and Surveys</u>: In early 2022, Chapel Hill community members were asked to prioritize the allocation of funds received through the American Rescue Plan Act to address the impact COVID-19 pandemic. The categories that had the highest levels of support were affordable housing, parks, and greenway improvements, and helping those in the most need. <p>In early 2022, Carrboro residents were asked to prioritize the allocation of funds received through the American Rescue Plan Act to address the economic fallout from the COVID-19 pandemic. The actions that had the highest levels of support were providing services to disproportionately impacted communities and investing in infrastructure. The Town of Carrboro will determine ARPA funding priorities in October 2022.</p>
Organizations and Nonprofits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <u>Outside Agency Award Program</u>: Each year, the Towns conduct a survey of nonprofits that applied for funding through the Outside Agency/Human Services Program. The purpose of the survey is to evaluate agency satisfaction with the funding process, so that staff can continue to make improvements going forward. <p>Staff from both jurisdictions hold a performance measures workshop, application orientation, and two Q&A sessions annually, and they are available to discuss their application one on one outside of these venues.</p> <p>In addition, nonprofits participate in public hearings to provide further feedback to the boards and commissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <u>Collaborations</u>: Community collaboration is important to both local governments, and both Towns are deeply invested in many coalitions, alliances, and collaboratives. For example, the Towns are represented by elected officials and staff on the Family Success Alliance (FSA) Advisory Council. (In response to significant disparities in opportunities for children and families in Orange County, the FSA was formed as a place-based initiative to work with Orange County families to ensure success from cradle to college and career.) This involvement with FSA “Navigators” provides valuable understanding of the complex needs and challenges facing low-income working families. <p>In addition, the Towns intentionally engage groups not affiliated with the Human Services Program or affordable housing efforts, such as Justice United, to gain more insight into strengths, challenges and needs we may not see.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <u>ARPA Interviews and Surveys</u>: The Town of Chapel Hill now has an application open for community partners to submit funding requests and has a general allocation plan approved by the Town Council at www.townofchapelhill.org/arpa <p>In 2021, Carrboro staff invited 47 nonprofits to discuss the community’s most pressing needs (and their own) after one year of COVID. Over 30 nonprofits participated in one-one interviews and discussed possibilities for ARPA funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ <u>Elected Officials</u>: Elected officials also serve on the Food Council (food security) and HOME Collaborative (affordable housing), and staff represent the Towns in several groups: Northside Neighborhood Initiative,

	Good Neighbor Initiative, Orange County Home Preservation Coalition, Orange County Affordable Housing Coalition, Orange County Partnership to End Homelessness.
--	---

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Towns engage with the public and nonprofits to connect people to resources, work collaboratively with agencies to assist residents, and to gather information that will inform Town’s goals and funding focus.
- Community informed needs assessment is the basis for the existing program
- Bi-annual community-wide surveys inform Council priorities (including human services funding)
- Nonprofits surveyed annually
- Beneficiaries of the program are surveyed by some nonprofits; however, beneficiaries do not provide feedback on the human services program

IMPACTS

Type	Potential Unintended Consequence	Mitigation Strategies to Prevent Consequences and Advance Racial Equity
------	----------------------------------	---

SOCIAL/ ECONOMIC/HEALTH

<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Insufficient funding ▫ Funding deliberations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Residents may not receive the services they need due to inadequate funding or program gaps. All program needs may not be met due to inadequate funding. ▫ Nonprofits who provide the same services may not receive adequate funding. Or funding could be seen as duplicative when similar programs are awarded funds. ▫ Nonprofit agency applications may not receive an equitable weight of consideration. Unconscious bias could factor into decision-making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Increase Town annual budgets for the Human Services funding. ▫ Community partners can collaborate on programs that are complementary or similar in nature to individuals served. Since the Towns are not the experts in these programs, it is important that the partners create a collaborative strategy for sharing resources (including Human Services funds) in ways that do not burden the partners’ operations (ex. financial, personnel) or the program participants (ex. intrusive surveys). The goal would be to maximize the quality of the program or service and/or the number of program participants. However, collaboration for sake of collaboration only would not be worthwhile. ▫ Use of scored rubric that builds in racial equity and takes nonprofit capacity into account. ▫ Consider grouping and comparing applicants of similar size, perhaps based on total annual revenue, so that a large, well-staffed agency is not competing directly with a new or smaller agency.
---	---	--

<p>Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Disparities in nonprofit capacity ▫ Effect on eligibility, application evaluation and funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ New nonprofits may be inexperienced in grant writing or reporting. Therefore, they may not be as competitive against other agency funding requests. ▫ Some agencies may not be able to provide the requested data due to limited capacity or the nature of the program is not conducive to data gathering (ex. Anonymous crisis helpline). ▫ The Towns do not have sufficient staff to adequately engage new & existing nonprofits who may not be aware of the outside agency funding process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Consider two groups of applicants, based on revenue size, to consider separately. The total amount budgeted would need to have a determined allocation for smaller nonprofits. ▫ The advisory boards may not like working within an additional funding parameter. ▫ Continue to be supportive of nonprofits who cannot provide quality data but reiterate the need for data from a racial equity standpoint. Find out what they would need to provide this data. Perhaps there is an opportunity to assist.
---	--	---

<p>Eligibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Human Services Framework ▫ Strategic Objective Categories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Some non-profits may not fall into the strategic objective categories within the framework but provide a vital service to the community and would need to seek other funding streams to serve Town residents. Rarely does outside agency funding cover the full cost of a program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Funding should align with need. The objectives were created based on community need and input. Currently, the Towns and County work with agencies to direct them to the appropriate Town/County funding (when available) and share grantmaking information from other funders, when available.
--	--	--

ENVIRONMENT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Paper documentation creates waste. ▫ Driving to in-person public hearings increases emissions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Have transitioned to accepting digital documents. ▫ Exploring hybrid/virtual meetings to mitigate the impacts on the environment.
--	---	--

Overall potential negative impact on individuals served

Nonprofits do provide vital services to our communities and this initiative was created to positively impact communities of color and low-income populations. However, if we dig deeper, we can see that nonprofits are part of a larger national system based on structural racism:

“Band-aid” solutions to systemic problems makes real progress difficult. 501c3 nonprofit status does not allow lobbying in general (a small amount of lobbying could be acceptable) – this tax status is not setup to address policy or political issues, only to serve unmet needs. The nonprofit would have to create an additional nonprofit, a 501(c)(4) in order to lobby.

Nonprofits/charities/philanthropy (rather than fair taxes, higher wages, and systemic overhaul to include racial equity) are preferred by corporations and the wealthy, both of whom can receive a tax benefit for their contributions. This system, involving the federal and state tax codes, benefits the white power structure.

“Charity” can often strip an individual’s sense of dignity, especially when charity is a basic need everyone has a right to.

Because we do not have direct contact to the individuals served, we believe the individuals are impacted by the following:

Access to transportation	Language barriers
Access to technology	Cultural differences
Access to childcare	Limited outreach
Time availability	Lived experience

This may lead to lower participation in community involvement and accessing programs.

Is your initiative realistic? Are there adequate resources to ensure successful implementation?

This program is established, realistic, and resourced. Future work involves continuing to fine-tune the program for applicants and boards; ensuring that the funding priorities reflect community priorities and needs; and centering racial equity in the program.

What challenges should be overcome? How?

Challenges

- Difficulty in ensuring all non-profits are aware of this funding process, especially new nonprofits
- Additional outreach to new nonprofits may dilute awards to existing nonprofits without adequate/increased funding
- Application process may pose language/accessibility barriers
- Inadequate funding
- Achieve greater diversity on the advisory boards
- Nonprofits increase diversity within their organization, especially in leadership roles
- Obtain better data on who is being served by the nonprofits

Strategies

- Increase the Human Services budget (see table below)
- Community outreach to continue town’s work to seek board diversity
- Support newer or under-resourced nonprofits
- Coordinate avenues of communication (news flash, social media, etc.) to inform all local nonprofits of this funding resource
- Explore how language/accessibility barriers impact this initiative

Share any relevant data?

Annual requests far exceed the Human Services budget, see historical data of funding requests and awards below:

Funding Year	Chapel Hill		Carrboro	
	Requested	Awarded	Requested	Awarded
FY22-23	\$1,379,230	\$546,500	\$532,896	\$274,000
FY21-22	\$1,186,005	\$546,500	\$550,569	\$274,000
FY20-21	\$998,463	\$446,500	\$443,440	\$274,000
FY19-20	\$1,307,718	\$446,500	\$472,065	\$249,000
Total	\$4,871,416	\$1,986,000	\$1,998,970	\$1,071,000

Over the past four years Chapel Hill has funded 41% of the total amount requested and Carrboro 54% of the total amount requested.

ACCOUNTABILITY

How will the impact of the initiative be measured?

The results framework measures agency performance utilizing [performance indicators](#). The performance indicators established in the results framework are measured and reported on annually by agencies funded through this program and data is disaggregated by gender, race, ethnicity, and age. The performance measures were developed by community members, advisory boards, and staff.

What success indicators or progress benchmarks are incorporated in the initiative?
What will happen if these metrics are met and what will happen if they are not met?

Indicators are evaluated during the semi-annual reports submitted by agencies. In Chapel Hill, if goals/benchmarks are met, agencies receive their awarded funding. If goals/benchmarks are not met, agency funding can be impacted, which in turn impacts the level of service agencies are able to provide to residents. In Carrboro, this can mean agencies need to return their funding allocation.

What is missing?

We currently do not gather income by race or identify the number of individuals at the lower income levels, such as those that earn 30% AMI and below.

Data gathered from agencies does not specifically identify individuals served by race and ethnicity for each jurisdiction, rather, it identifies race and ethnicity for individuals served by the overall program. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the racial makeup of those served specifically for the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro.

Nonprofit agency board and leadership demographics is not a requirement for applying. Therefore, we are unable to determine the makeup of the individuals that are responsible for funding decisions.

In what way does this initiative deeply consider the experience of the residents it will impact?

The program itself was created with the intent of improving the outcomes and opportunities for low-income and otherwise disenfranchised individuals and families and is based on data and community feedback. Progress towards goals and demographic reporting help assess the effectiveness of the funded programs. The Advisory Boards have been advocating for community representation and there has been progress at the agency leadership level. During the public hearings Commission members continue to inquire about program participant involvement in program design.

How will you share you results with your leadership and other funders?

This assessment will be reviewed by the Racial Equity Core Team(s). The assessment may be revised based on the comments received. A draft version will also be shared the Human Services Advisory Boards and, depending on the recommendations, potentially Town Councils.

How will you share results with community members and stakeholders?

Shared results will be dependent upon the direction of the RE Commission and/or Town Councils.

How will you acquire feedback from community members and stakeholders and incorporate findings?

During the meetings noted above, staff will take notes and ask the stakeholders for specific recommendations. Also, the application cycle is reviewed each year by Town staff, Advisory Boards, and nonprofits through an annual survey. Feedback can be discussed and, if desired, changes incorporated into future application cycles.

KEY FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Current funding levels are inadequate. Annually, the total amount requested approximately doubles the amount available. As the income gap widens and inflation rises, we anticipate community needs to increase.
- The Towns believe community engagement is important; however, with targeted outreach we may continue to receive more funding requests than the allocated budget available.

Recommendation:

- ★ Increase the Human Services Budget annually
- ★ Enhance outreach efforts to small and/or new organizations that may not be aware of this funding resource.

- For nonprofit applicants, some of the application requirements may create barriers for agencies that do not have access to resources/technology to track agency data.
- The nature of the work of some nonprofits may not be conducive to data gathering, ex. crisis hotlines. In some instances, gathering data can create a barrier for residents accessing resources ex: Orange County Rape Crisis Center.
- In tracking demographics, there is not currently a way to de-duplicate individuals served by multiple agencies. Smaller nonprofit agencies may not have the capacity to provide the demographic data that is requested.

Recommendation:

- ★ **Explore online grant portal to alleviate staff and agency burdens.**
- ★ **The Outside Agency Application should be made accessible in other languages. Board members, community partners and residents should be able to access the application in plain language and languages other than English.**
- ★ **Enhance ongoing technical assistance to organizations to support those who need assistance with the application process and reporting and monitoring, building off the success we have had with holding annual workshops on performance measures.**
- ★ **Reduce the reporting requirements, which are burdensome especially for smaller funding awards.**

- The Town of Chapel Hill uses a rubric to score applications; however, Carrboro does not use a rubric to help determine funding recommendations. An analysis is needed in order to determine if nonprofits receive equitable treatment when only one Town uses a rubric, and if Chapel Hill's rubric factors in a nonprofit's resources or program nature when reviewing requested data. It should also be considered if and how racial equity can be incorporated into the rubric. The Towns need to consult with their attorneys to see if race can be used as a factor in decision making.

Recommendation:

- ★ **Implement a detailed scoring rubric (for both Carrboro and Chapel Hill) and use the scoring as the basis for the advisory board recommendations to limit subjectivity of funding recommendations and improve consistency.**
- ★ **Eliminate the informal practice of not funding new organizations, which disproportionately impacts small, BIPOC groups.**
- ★ **Consider making funding awards up-front rather than on a reimbursement basis for awards below a certain amount of money, which would allow for smaller organizations with less operating reserve to be eligible for funding.**

- Additional information is needed from applicants to assess racial equity, in the agencies and their programs. Regular review of local data (such as a community needs assessment) is necessary in order to determine how the programs strategic objectives align with current needs and disparities.
- The Towns do not engage beneficiaries directly to gauge the qualitative experience of the funded programs.

Recommendation:

- ★ **Continue to advocate for diverse representation, especially at the leadership levels of non-profits.**
- ★ **Explore increased engagement, bearing in mind the potential creation of additional staff burden, anonymity impact, or personal comfort levels.**
- ★ **Consider conducting a community wide needs assessment to align the program, services, and funding to current community needs.**
- ★ **Information is gathered from the nonprofits to gauge effectiveness of their programs – Nonprofits provide some information in progress reports – recommend adding specific language to progress report to gather feedback on a regular basis.**

SIGNATURES OF ASSESSOR(S):

Anne-Marie Vanaman – Town of Carrboro
 Zequel Hall – Town of Carrboro

Jackie Thompson – Town of Chapel Hill
Rebecca Buzzard – Town of Chapel Hill
Sarah Vinas - Chapel Hill

DATE REVIEWED BY CORE TEAM:

RECOMMENDATIONS – CORE TEAM:

DATE REVIEWED BY RACIAL EQUITY COMMISSION:

RECOMMENDATIONS – RACIAL EQUITY COMMISSION:



Human Services Program Results Framework



The Town of Chapel Hill and the Town of Carrboro’s Human Services Program funds programs that improve education, livelihood security, and health outcomes for all residents. The program’s overarching goal is to achieve economic and social wellbeing and opportunities to thrive for all residents, particularly those who are low-income or otherwise disenfranchised.

Goal: All Chapel Hill and Carrboro residents experience economic and social well-being & opportunities to thrive

Strategic Objective 1:

Children improve their education outcomes

Strategic Objective 2:

Residents increase their livelihoods security

Strategic Objective 3:

Residents improve their health outcomes

Intermediate Result 1.1:
Children birth-to-K access early childhood development opportunities

Intermediate Result 1.2: Children demonstrate new grade-level-appropriate skills

Intermediate Result 2.1: Residents access the most appropriate social safety net services

Intermediate Result 2.2: Residents increase job skills appropriate for the local economy

Intermediate Result 3.1: Residents access basic health care services (primary, behavioral, dental)

Intermediate Result 3.2:
Residents demonstrate new healthy lifestyle behaviors

Strategic Objective 1: Children improve their education outcomes

Intermediate Result 1.1: Children birth-to-K access early childhood development opportunities

Agency Performance Indicators

- % and # of children receiving scholarships who attend licensed, 4-5-star childcare facilities
- % and # of program participant children who are read age-appropriate books in their home once a week
- % and # of children referred to socio-emotional health services that complete an age appropriate therapeutic or enrichment program

Intermediate Result 1.2: Children demonstrate new grade-level-appropriate skills (grades K-12)

Agency Performance Indicators

- % and # of program participants that are promoted to the next grade
- % and # of program participants that improve grades by end of program period
- % and # of program participants that improve classroom behavior
- % and # of program participants that express greater confidence in their ability to be successful at school
- % and # of program participants that express greater confidence in their leadership and pro-social abilities
- % and # of children referred to socio-emotional health services that complete an age appropriate therapeutic or enrichment program
- % and # of program participants who plan on attending post-secondary education

Strategic Objective 2: Residents increase their livelihoods security

Intermediate Result 2.1: Residents access the most appropriate social safety net services

Agency Performance Indicators

- % and # of program participants with knowledge of appropriate social services
- % and # of completed referrals
- % and # Client satisfaction rates
- % and # of program participants who meet at least 1 financial goal
- % and # of program participants who maintain or improve their housing status
- % and # of unduplicated community members who receive emergency shelter services
- % and # of program participants who are homeless or experiencing unstable housing who obtain housing
- % and # of individuals that receive abuse and neglect prevention and response services
- % and # of program participants that receive food assistance
- % and # of individuals who receive emergency financial assistance for essential needs
- % and # of individuals who receive legal information, services or referral
- % and # of participants who do not become court involved during the program

Intermediate Result 2.2: Residents increase job skills appropriate for the local economy

Agency Performance Indicators

- % and # of participants who pass ESL tests
- % and # of participants who self-report improved English language abilities
- % and # of participants who earn GEDs
- % and # of program participants who secure employment
- % and # of program participants who report improved wages and benefits
- % and # of program participants who report that services enabled employment, education or training
- % and # of participants who increase incomes (wages, disability, public benefits, or other income)
- % and # of participants who maintain incomes (wages, disability, public benefits, or other income)

Strategic Objective 3: Residents improve their health outcomes

Intermediate Result 3.1: Residents access basic health care services (primary, behavioral, dental)

Agency Performance Indicators

- % and # of program participants that report they have access to primary care
- % and # of program participants that report they have access to behavioral care
- % and # of program participants that report they have access to dental care
- % and # of program participants who report they have improved access to health care services
- % and # of preventive screenings provided
- % and # of individuals referred to health promotion and/or healthcare services
- % and # of program participants that report they have access to substance abuse treatment

Intermediate Result 3.2: Residents demonstrate new healthy lifestyle behaviors

Agency Performance Indicators

- # of people reporting healthier functionality and lifestyle behaviors (improved nutrition, conflict resolution skills, stress reduction practices, exercise at least 30min 3x a week, annual check-ups, etc.)
- % and # of program participants who demonstrate new physical skills that support their independence
- % and # of program participants who demonstrate new, improved, or restored social skills
- % and # of program participants who demonstrate new, improved, or restored life skills
- % and # of program participants who report new, improved, or restored social connections
- % and # of program participants who meet one wellness goal
- % and # of program participants who comply with treatment
- % and # of hospitalization rates among program participants with substance abuse and/or psychiatric disorders
- % and # of program participants that consume fresh food

Other Measures

- Total residents served
- % and # of agencies that pay employees a living wage
- % and # of agencies that offer health benefits to employees

Key Terms

- **Goal:** The longer-term, wider change to which the program contributes.
- **Strategic Objective (SO):** The benefit expected to occur for beneficiary groups. SOs express the central purpose of the program in a realistic, specific, measurable way.
- **Intermediate Result (IR):** The expected change in identifiable behaviors of a specific group or the expected change in systems, policies or institutions required to achieve the strategic objectives.
- **Output:** The goods, services, knowledge, skills, attitudes and enabling environment that are delivered by the project (as a result of the activities undertaken).
- **Indicators:** Quantitative or qualitative factors or variables that provide a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor. Performance indicator statements should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time bound).

Measurement

In a results framework, results statements are measured through performance indicators. Agency performance indicators will be measured and reported on annually by funded agencies.

The Human Services Program will report on the overall results. During the first year of implementation of the results framework, staff will determine the appropriate frequency of measurement and reporting. We anticipate being able to disaggregate measures by gender, race, ethnicity, age, and disability status.

Demographics

During the development of the framework, the following datasets were used:

1. US Census Bureau - 2016 [ex: Town Population]
2. State of the Community Reports - 2018 [ex: Population by Race]
3. American Community Survey - 2015 [ex: Income by Race]
4. NC Department of Public Instruction - 2016 [ex: Graduation Rates]
5. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation [ex: County Health Indicators]
6. NCDHHS – 2014 [ex: Teen Pregnancy]
7. Town of Chapel Hill, Affordable Housing Development FY18 Progress Report [ex: Housing Indicators]
8. Orange County Partnership to End Homelessness - 2016 [ex: Homeless Demographics]

Annual assessment of the community's health: [2020 State of the County Health Report](#) based on data from:

1. NC DHHS (2021). NC SCHS: Statistics and Reports: County Health Data Book
2. Orange County (2021). Orange County Health Department: COVID-19 Dashboards
3. Orange County (2019). 2019 Orange County Community Health Assessment.
4. NC DHHS (2019). New Data Dashboard Illustrates State, County Impacts of Excessive Alcohol Use in NC
5. County Health Rankings (2021). Alcohol Outlet Density Restrictions
6. APHA (2021). American Public Health Association: Racism and Health

Funding Summary By Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health
Individuals Served	10,424	39,895	34,954
Nonprofit Agency Programs Funded	18	29	24

Human Services Funding % of Individuals Served by Location	% Served
Chapel Hill Public Housing	1.93%
Town of Chapel Hill	29.88%
Town of Carrboro	11.63%

Orange County	9.21%
Outside Orange County	11.76%
Other	1.50%
Not Indicated	34.09%

Gender Served by Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health
Male	4,881 [50%]	8,055 [20%]	6,387 [26%]
Female	4,810 [49%]	24,839 [62%]	8,327 [35%]
Non-Binary	43 [0.4%]	4,949 [12%]	10 [0.04%]
Self-Describe	-----	299 [1%]	1,140 [5%]
Unknown	-----	1,685 [4%]	8,120 [34%]

Age Served by Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health
0-5 Years	1,803 [17%]	616 [2%]	1,307 [4%]
6-18 Years	7,277 [70%]	4,200 [11%]	10,693 [32%]
19-50 Years	991 [10%]	8,822 [22%]	9,440 [28%]
51+ Years	360 [3%]	3,521 [9%]	3,792 [11%]
Unknown	3 [0.03%]	22,107 [56%]	8,320 [25%]

Demographics

Race Served by Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health
African American	3,172 [30%]	5,173 [13%]	8,345 [28%]
Amer. Indian / Alaskan Native	128 [1%]	98 [0.3%]	40 [0.1%]
Asian	2,411 [23%]	2,749 [7%]	2,067 [7%]
Ntv. Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	192 [2%]	80 [0.2%]	889 [3%]
Other Race	1,704 [16%]	4,462 [11%]	2,399 [8%]
White	2,809 [27%]	4,697 [12%]	8,075 [27%]
Unknown	8 [0.1%]	22,576 [57%]	8,353 [28%]
Ethnicity Served by Objective	Strategic Objective 1: Education	Strategic Objective 2: Livelihood	Strategic Objective 3: Health
Hispanic/Latinx	2,367 [23%]	4,500 [11%]	6,834 [28%]
Non-Hispanic Latinx	8,053 [77%]	16,704 [42%]	9,406 [39%]
Unknown	4 [0.04%]	18,690 [47%]	7,872 [33%]

Attachment 4: Nonprofit Research

- [Nonprofit Leadership in Orange County: So White | OrangePolitics](#)
- [The Diversity Gap in the Nonprofit Sector | The sustainable nonprofit | Features | PND \(philanthropynewsdigest.org\)](#)
- [The Impact of Diversity on Board Outcomes \(boardsource.org\)](#)
- [Why Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Matter for Nonprofits | National Council of Nonprofits](#)
- [Better Decisions Through Diversity \(northwestern.edu\)](#)
- [EquityWorkWithNPBoardStaff.pdf\(ncnonprofits.org\)](#)
- [AECF EmbracingEquity7Steps-2014.pdf](#)
- [Recruiting for Board Diversity — Without Disrespecting People of Color \(boardsource.org\)](#)
- [Board Diversity Executive Summary \(iupui.edu\)](#)
- [When it comes to data, let's just agree to disaggregate - Technical.ly](#)
- [nonprofit white paper.pdf \(battaliawinston.com\)](#)