

July 13, 2021

To: County Council

From: Natalia Carrizosa, Legislative Analyst
Office of Legislative Oversight

Subject: Update on Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

In September 2020, the County Council approved a special appropriation for Montgomery Moving Forward, a collective impact initiative of Nonprofit Montgomery, to evaluate best practices, identify necessary legislative action, and recommend a governance structure and responsibilities for a public-private early care and education (ECE) coordinating entity. This OLO memorandum report provides additional background information to assist the Council in determining their approach for establishing this ECE coordinating entity, including:

- **Section A:** An update of the case studies of children’s trusts in other jurisdictions, previously described in OLO Memorandum Report 2016-11; and
- **Section B:** An analysis of the legislation that allowed the Council to designate four nonprofit organizations as representing the County’s interest in particular areas: *the Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families (Collaboration Council)*, *Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation (MCEDC)*, *Arts and Humanities Council of Montgomery County (AHCMC)*, and *Montgomery Coalition for Adult English Literacy (MCAEL)*.

Summary of Findings

Children’s Trusts

- Other jurisdictions have used a variety of different revenue strategies to fund children’s services, including special taxing districts, special tax levies, guaranteed set-asides, and fees or narrowly-based taxes; and
- Case study jurisdictions established specific planning, evaluation and reporting requirements for their children’s trusts in legislation or charter amendments.

County-Designated Nonprofit Organizations

- Each of the organizations reviewed in this report has a different legal framework that defines its relationship with County Government;
- The County Code specifies the size, composition and appointment process for the governing boards of two out of the four organizations (The Collaboration Council and the MCEDC); and
- The County Code includes specific requirements for three out of the four organizations to submit regular reports on their finances and activities to the County (the Collaboration Council, the MCEDC, and the AHCMC).

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

A. Update on Children’s Trusts

OLO Memorandum Report 2016-11: Out of School Time and Children’s Trusts described local demand for out of school time activities for school-aged children along with practices in other jurisdictions to expand these types of programs. The report described how some jurisdictions have established dedicated local revenue sources to expand child serving programs in their communities (including out of school time programs) which the report referred to as “children’s trusts.” This section provides an update on the six jurisdictions highlighted in the 2016 report, focusing on governance and oversight:

- Miami-Dade County, FL Children’s Trust;
- City of Seattle, WA Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy;
- City of Portland, OR Children’s Levy;
- City of Oakland, CA Fund for Children and Youth;
- City of San Francisco, CA Children & Youth Fund; and
- City of Philadelphia, PA Beverage Tax.

The table below provides updated demographic information for each of the six jurisdictions reviewed in the 2016 memorandum report. The jurisdictions vary widely demographically.

Children’s Trust Community Demographics¹

	Miami-Dade County, FL Children’s Trust	City of Seattle, WA Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy	City of Portland, OR Children’s Levy	City of Oakland, CA Fund for Children and Youth	City of San Francisco, CA Children & Youth Fund	City of Philadelphia, PA Beverage Tax
Population	2,716,940	753,675	654,741	433,031	881,549	1,584,064
Race						
<i>Asian</i>	2%	15%	8%	16%	34%	7%
<i>Black</i>	18%	7%	6%	24%	5%	42%
<i>White</i>	13%	46%	71%	28%	41%	35%
<i>Hispanic</i>	69%	7%	10%	27%	15%	15%
<i>Other</i>	2%	8%	7%	8%	6%	4%
% in Poverty	16%	11%	14%	17%	10%	24%
Median Household Income	\$51,347	\$92,263	\$71,005	\$73,692	\$112,449	\$45,927

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, "Population Estimates, July 1, 2019" Quick Facts, accessed April 15, 2021, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts> ; “White” refers to non-Hispanic White, “Other” includes individuals that identified as American Indian and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More Races; population percentages may add up to more than 100% because some individuals that identify as being of Hispanic ethnicity may also be included in the other categories which are race categories.

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

1. Revenues and Legislative History of Children’s Trusts

In five out of the six jurisdictions, dedicated revenue streams for children’s services, either through new taxes or budget set-asides, were established via voter referendum in accordance with local charters and/or state laws where applicable. In contrast, the Beverage Tax in the City of Philadelphia was proposed by the Mayor and approved by the City Council and did not legally require a voter referendum. The following table summarizes the revenue streams for each of the jurisdictions, organized by revenue strategy.

Summary of Revenue Sources of Children’s Trusts in Other Jurisdictions

Revenue Strategy	Jurisdictions and Financing Assumptions	Annual Revenue
<i>Special Taxing Districts</i>	<u>Miami-Dade</u> Children’s Trust relies on a 45-cent tax per \$1,000 in assessed property.	\$140 million ²
<i>Special Tax Levies</i>	<u>Seattle</u> Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy applies a 34-cent tax per \$1,000 in assessed property. <u>Portland’s</u> Children’s Levy taxes 40 cents per \$1,000 in assessed property.	\$85 million ³ \$23 million ⁴
<i>Guaranteed Set-Asides</i>	<u>Oakland</u> Fund for Children and Youth relies on a budget set aside of 3% of unrestricted general revenue. <u>San Francisco</u> Children and Youth Fund relies on a set aside of 40 cents per \$1,000 in assessed property.	\$21 million ⁵ \$192 million ⁶
<i>Fees and Narrow Taxes</i>	<u>Philadelphia</u> Beverage Tax for Pre-K applies a 1.5 cent tax per ounce of soft drinks/sweetened beverages.	\$73 million ⁷

² The Children’s Trust Budget Summary: Fiscal Year 2020-2021, The Children’s Trust, July, 2020, https://www.thechildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/kcfinder/files/about_us/financials/FY20-21/2021_BudgetSchedules_JULY_072720.pdf

³ Department of Education and Early Learning, City of Seattle, 2021 Adopted Budget, p. 166, <https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/FinanceDepartment/21adoptedbudget/DEEL.pdf>

⁴ City of Portland, Oregon Adopted Budget, Fiscal Year 2020-21, Volume 2, City Funds and Capital Projects, p. 99, <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo/article/764228>

⁵ Adam Benson to the Mayor and City Council of the City of Oakland, July 2, 2020, Explanation of the Exhibits to the Resolution Amending the FY 2020-21 Midcycle Budget, Exhibit 3, p.5, [Adopted-Reso-and-Exhibits-w-Cover-Memo.pdf \(cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com\)](https://cao-94612.s3.amazonaws.com/Adopted-Reso-and-Exhibits-w-Cover-Memo.pdf)

⁶ FY 2020-2021 & FY 2021-2022 Mayor’s Proposed Budget and Appropriate Ordinance, p. 68, <https://openbook.sfgov.org/webreports/details3.aspx?id=2864>

⁷ The Mayor’s Operating Budget in Brief for Fiscal Year 2021, As Proposed to the Council - May 2020, p. 13, <https://www.phila.gov/media/20200501075517/REVISED-Budget-in-Brief-FY21.pdf>

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

The paragraphs below describe the legal basis for each of the six jurisdictions’ revenue streams in more detail.

- **Miami-Dade County, FL: Children’s Trust.** Florida state law allows Florida counties to create, by ordinance, an independent special district to fund children’s services. Services are funded by levying a property tax, subject to voter approval.⁸ The Miami-Dade Children’s Trust was established by public referendum in 2002 and reauthorized for perpetuity in 2008.⁹
- **City of Seattle, WA: Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy.** Washington State law imposes a “limit factor” on taxing districts in the State to restrict increases in property tax levies. However, a taxing district may levy a property tax in excess of the limit if a majority of voters approve a proposition authorizing the increased levy.¹⁰ Voters in Seattle approved the six-year Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy in 2018, replacing two expiring levies – the 2011 Families and Education Levy and the 2014 Preschool Levy.¹¹
- **City of Portland, OR: Children’s Levy.** The Portland City Charter allows the City to levy special taxes for fixed amounts or limited terms if a majority of voters approve.¹² In 2002, Portland voters approved a five-year property tax levy, creating the Portland Children’s Levy, which has been reauthorized three times (2008, 2013 and 2018).¹³
- **City of Oakland, CA: Fund for Children and Youth.** Through a public referendum in 1996, voters approved an amendment to the City Charter that required the City to set aside a portion of unrestricted general funds for the Oakland Fund for Children and Youth (OFCY). In 2009, voters approved another amendment to the Charter that reauthorized the set aside and increased it from 2.5% to 3%.¹⁴ The 2009 charter amendment is in effect until 2033, but must be reauthorized by the City Council every 12 years by a majority vote.¹⁵ The Oakland City Council reauthorized the OFCY in 2020 for a third twelve-year term.¹⁶

⁸ § 125.901, Fla. Stat. (2005)

⁹ “Frequently Asked Questions,” The Children’s Trust, <https://www.thechildrenstrust.org/content/frequently-asked-questions>, accessed 4/12/2021.

¹⁰ Revised Code of Washington, Chapter 84.55.050

¹¹ The Seattle Times editorial board, “The Times recommends: Vote yes for Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy,” Seattle Times (Seattle, WA), October 15, 2018, <https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/the-times-recommends-vote-yes-for-families-education-preschool-and-promise-levy/>

¹² Portland City Charter, § 7-112

¹³ “What We Do,” Portland Children’s Levy, <https://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about/what-we-do>, accessed 4/12/2021.

¹⁴ “About Us,” Oakland Fund for Children and Youth, <https://www.ofcy.org/about-us/>, accessed 4/14/2021

¹⁵ Oakland City Charter, Article XIII, § 1300 and § 1307.

¹⁶ “About Us,” Oakland Fund for Children and Youth.

- **City of San Francisco, CA: Children & Youth Fund.** In 1991, voters approved an amendment to the City Charter via a public ballot initiative to set aside a portion of local property tax dollars for the Children and Youth Fund in addition to a baseline level of expenditures for children's services. The Fund has since been reauthorized twice by public referendum (2000 and 2014). In 2014, the Fund was reauthorized for 25 years.¹⁷
- **City of Philadelphia, PA: Beverage Tax.** In 2016, the Mayor of Philadelphia proposed and the City Council approved a tax on soda and other sweetened beverages with the stated goal of funding the City's pre-K expansion and Community Schools program as well as pay the City's debt obligations. Neither the City Charter nor Pennsylvania state law required a voter referendum to create the tax.¹⁸

1. Governing or Advisory Bodies of Children's Trusts

The statutes and ordinances that establish dedicated revenue streams for children's services in five of the six jurisdictions designate a governing or advisory body to administer or advise the jurisdiction's legislative body on the administration of the funds:

- Miami-Dade Children's Trust is established as an independent special district and its Governing Board has ultimate authority over the administration of revenues.
- Dedicated revenue streams in Seattle, Portland, Oakland and San Francisco are under the authority of the local legislative body that must approve the recommendations of the designated advisory body.
- The Philadelphia Beverage Tax does not have a dedicated governing or advisory body and is administered by the City of Philadelphia.

The table below summarizes the composition of the governing or advisory body for each jurisdiction's children's trust in more detail.

¹⁷ San Francisco City Charter, § 16.108 and Mitchell, A., Stoney, L. and Dichter, H., *Financing Child Care In the United States: An Expanded Catalog of Current Strategies*, The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, 2001, p. 19.

¹⁸ McCrystal, Laura, "A timeline of Philadelphia's soda tax," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 29, 2019, <https://www.inquirer.com/news/timeline-philadelphias-soda-tax-20190429.html>, accessed 4/12/2021.

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Governing or Advisory Body of Children’s Trusts

Jurisdiction and Entity	Governing or Advisory Body
Miami-Dade County, FL Children’s Trust	The Children’s Trust is an independent special district with a 33-member Governing Board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 specified public officials or their designees; • 8 representatives of specified community organizations; • 4 members appointed by the sitting board; and • 7 members appointed by the Governor of Florida.¹⁹
City of Seattle, WA Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy	A 17-member Oversight Committee is responsible for making funding recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 public officials; and • 12 members appointed by the Mayor and the City Council that “represent the organizations and communities that are impacted by Levy investments.”²⁰
City of Portland, OR Children’s Levy	A 5-member Allocation Committee is responsible for allocating funding (subject to final approval by the City Council): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 public officials; • 2 private citizens; and • 1 representative from the business community.²¹
City of Oakland, CA Fund for Children and Youth	The 17-member Planning and Oversight Committee is responsible for submitting funding recommendations and evaluation reports to the City Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 Oakland residents, of which 8 may not be older than 21 years, appointed by City Councilmembers; and • 1 Oakland resident appointed by the Mayor.²²
City of San Francisco, CA Children & Youth Fund	The 11-member Oversight and Advisory Committee is responsible for making funding recommendations and overseeing the administration of the Children and Youth Fund: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 members appointed by the Mayor; and • 5 members appointed by the Board of Supervisors.²³
City of Philadelphia, PA Beverage Tax	The ordinance does not specify a dedicated governing or advisory body to administer the revenues. ²⁴ Revenues from the Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Tax are included in the City of Philadelphia’s General Fund.

¹⁹ Miami-Dade County Code of Ordinances, § 2-1522.

²⁰ City of Seattle Ordinance No. 125604

²¹ Portland City Council, Resolution 37343

²² Charter of the City of Oakland, Article XIII

²³ San Francisco Charter, § 16.108

²⁴ Philadelphia Code, Chapter 19-4100

2. Current Activities of Children’s Trusts

Each of the case study jurisdictions uses its dedicated funding stream to fund a range of children’s services, including ECE services. The exhibit below lists the service areas funded in each jurisdiction as described in published reports.

Children’s Trust Service Areas	
Miami-Dade County, FL: Children’s Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early childhood development • Health & wellness • Parenting, family & neighborhood supports • Youth development • Special populations • Community awareness & advocacy • Program & professional development
City of Seattle, WA: Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool and early learning • K-12 school and community-based services • Post-secondary opportunities
City of Portland, OR: Children’s Levy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early childhood • Child abuse prevention and intervention • Foster care • Afterschool programs and mentoring • Hunger relief
City of Oakland, CA: Fund for Children and Youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent engagement and support • Socioemotional wellbeing in early childhood education • Afterschool programs and youth development • Success in elementary and middle school • High school and postsecondary success • Career awareness and employment support
City of San Francisco, CA: Children & Youth Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early care and education • Out of school time and mentorship • Educational supports • Justice services • Youth workforce development • Emotional well-being • Family empowerment
Philadelphia, PA: Beverage Tax	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-K • Community Schools

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

3. Planning, Evaluation and Reporting Requirements for Children’s Trusts

The statutes and ordinances establishing children’s trusts also include service planning, evaluation, and reporting requirements, summarized below. These requirements define how to determine funding priorities and can specify the schedule and content of regular reports on the outputs and outcomes of funded services.

Children’s Trust Planning, Evaluation and Reporting Requirements

Jurisdiction and Entity	Requirements
Miami-Dade County, FL Children’s Trust	<p>Governing Board must provide the Miami-Dade County Board of Commissioners with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of the services to be provided (anticipated schedule, partnerships involved and proposed outreach) within a year of the effective date of the ordinance; and • An annual report by January 1 that includes information on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the services.²⁵
City of Seattle, WA Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy	<p>Department of Education and Early Learning must spend the proceeds of the levy in accordance with an Implementation and Evaluation Plan that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority criteria; • Measurable outcomes; • Methodology for selecting and evaluating strategies; • The process and schedule for selecting and contracting with providers; and • The evaluation methodology for specific investments and overall impacts. <p>The Oversight Committee must review an annual report that includes outcome data for the previous school year to inform any changes to programs.²⁶</p>
City of Portland, OR Children’s Levy	<p>Staff must collect and report annually to the Allocation Committee data from all funded programs on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of participants served; • Hours of service provided; • Demographics of participants; • Participation rates; • Participant outcomes; and • Program staff turnover.²⁷

²⁵ Miami-Dade County Code of Ordinances, § 2-1522

²⁶ City of Seattle Ordinance No. 125604

²⁷ Portland City Council, Resolution 37343

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Jurisdiction and Entity	Requirements
City of Oakland, CA Fund for Children and Youth	<p>The Charter requires that appropriations from the Fund be based on a Three-Year Strategic Investment Plan that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An assessment of service needs and gaps regarding the Fund’s four outcome goals; • A description of services to address each goal, including target populations, performance and impact objectives, intervention strategies, and evaluation plans; and • A description of how planned services are aligned with other public and private resources. <p>The Charter also requires an independent, third-party evaluation of each Strategic Investment Plan.²⁸</p>
City of San Francisco, CA Children & Youth Fund	<p>The Charter requires the Children & Youth Fund follow a Five-Year Planning Cycle that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Community Needs Assessment (CNA) in Year 1 that uses interviews, focus groups, surveys and other mechanisms to determine service gaps; • A Services and Allocation Plan in Year 2 that establishes which services are eligible for funding based on the CNA; • Selection of contractors in Year 3 using a competitive solicitation process; • Beginning of service cycle in Year 4; and • Evaluation and Data Reports for review by the Oversight and Advisory Committee on a “regular basis.”²⁹
City of Philadelphia, PA Beverage Tax	<p>The ordinance does not establish reporting requirements for use of revenues.³⁰</p>

4. Early Care and Education Services and Performance Data of Children’s Trusts

The following table lists the services provided by each Children’s Trust in the area of early care and education, as well as selected publicly reported performance data. In some cases, such as in Seattle and San Francisco, publicly available performance data is limited to expenditures and/or services provided. In contrast, Miami-Dade County, the City of Portland and the City of Oakland report outcome-level data, often based on client surveys.

²⁸ Charter of the City of Oakland, Article XIII

²⁹ San Francisco Charter, § 16.108

³⁰ Philadelphia Code, Chapter 19-4100

Children's Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Children's Trusts Early Care and Education Services and Performance Data

Early Care and Education Services	Selected Early Care and Education Performance Data
Miami-Dade County, FL Children's Trust³¹	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child care quality improvement system (QIS) • Access to child care • Developmental screening, assessment & early intervention • Community research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45% increase in providers participating in QIS • 10% turnover among recipients of salary supplements for educators (national average 30%) • Early childhood mental health program participants reported they were more able to handle difficulties
City of Seattle, WA Families, Education, Preschool and Promise Levy³²	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool services, tuition, and supports • Child care subsidies • Homeless child care program • Family child care mentorship & quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seattle Preschool Program expenditures increased from \$9 million to \$23 million from FY16 to FY19 • Seattle Preschool Program seats increased from 280 to 1,520 from FY16 to FY19
City of Portland, OR Children's Levy³³	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable and high-quality pre-school • Parent/family support for child development • Support for families and child care providers on guiding child behavior 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 83% of children met developmental milestones • 72% of children with delays referred for services • 95% of parents demonstrated or improved positive parenting practices
City of Oakland, CA Fund for Children and Youth³⁴	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultations with mental health professionals for early childhood educators • Individualized plans for children • Linkages to resources for special needs and mental health services for young children • Resources and programs for parents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early childhood mental health consultation services served 2,048 children at 49 sites • 73% of participating educators reported a better understanding of children's behavior • 74% of educators reported feeling better able to handle children's challenging behaviors
City of San Francisco, CA Children & Youth Fund³⁵	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to high quality early care and education programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10,837 children received Early Learning Scholarships • 12,189 parents & children used Resource Centers
City of Philadelphia, PA Beverage Tax³⁶	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free Pre-K programs for 3- and 4-year-olds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$38 million in revenues expended in Pre-K in FY20

³¹ "2019-2020 Annual Report," The Children's Trust, December 2020,

https://www.thechildrenstrust.org/sites/default/files/kcfinder/files/about_us/2020_Annual_Report_021621.pdf

³² "Results and Reports: Seattle Preschool Program," City of Seattle, <https://www.seattle.gov/education/about-us/about-the-levy/results-and-reports>, accessed 4/12/2021

³³ "Annual Performance Report, FY19-20," Portland Children's Levy,

<https://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/sites/default/files/documents/Annual-Performance-Report-FY19-20.pdf>

³⁴ "Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation: FY18-19," Oakland Fund for Children and Youth,

<https://www.ofcy.org/assets/Uploads/1-FY1819-Final-Report-EC-MHC-Strategy-Summary.pdf>

³⁵ "FY2018-2019 Service Highlights Brief," San Francisco Department of Children, Youth and Their Families, January, 2020, <https://www.dcyf.org/data-and-reports/2020/1/31/fy2018-2019-service-highlights-brief>

³⁶ "Data Release: Beverage Tax Revenue and Expenditures," Philadelphia Office of the Controller, December, 2020, <https://controller.phila.gov/philadelphia-audits/data-release-beverage-tax/>

B. Legislative Analysis of Montgomery County-Designated Nonprofit Organizations

This section responds to the Council's request to review existing legislation regarding four existing nonprofit organizations designated as representing the County's interest in particular areas. The Council asked OLO to examine the following four organizations:

- The Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families (Collaboration Council);
- The Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation (MCEDC);
- The Arts and Humanities Council of Montgomery County (AHCMC); and
- The Montgomery Coalition for Adult English Literacy (MCAEL).

The tables on the following pages summarize each organization's legal framework, purpose, responsibilities, board composition and accountability measures. The analysis is focused on requirements established in the County Code and State Law and does not include a detailed review of the organizations' bylaws or contracts with the County. In summary:

- **Legal Framework and Purpose.** Each of the four organizations reviewed in this section has a different legal framework that defines its relationship with the County Government. Three organizations – the Collaboration Council, MCEDC, and the AHCMC – are designated entities defined in the County Code. The Collaboration Council, as the County's Local Management Board, is also an entity defined in State Law. In contrast, MCAEL's role was defined in a Council resolution endorsing the organization's creation, but this resolution was not codified in the County Code.³⁷ MCAEL has received non-competitive contract awards from the County since Fiscal Year 2008, consistent with the County's procurement law³⁸, to fulfill that role.
- **Duties and Responsibilities.** State Law and the County Code establish the specific duties and responsibilities of the Collaboration Council, the MCEDC and the AHCMC. MCAEL's contract with Montgomery County Government lays out its responsibilities connected with the contract.
- **Board Composition.** The County Code specifies the size and composition of the Collaboration Council and MCEDC's governing boards. In contrast, the County Code does not define the size, composition or appointment process of the governing boards of the AHCMC or MCAEL.
- **Accountability Measures.** The County Code requires the Collaboration Council, the MCEDC and the AHCMC to provide annual reports to the County on their finances and activities. While the County Code does not include specific requirements for MCAEL, their contract with the County includes reporting requirements.

³⁷ CR 15-558

³⁸ MCC § 11B-14

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Collaboration Council for Children, Youth and Families (Collaboration Council)	
<i>Defining Law or Resolution</i>	MCC ³⁹ §2-117- §2-123; and MD Code Ann., Human Services, § 8-301-§ 8-306 ⁴⁰
<i>Type of Organization</i>	Quasi-public, nonprofit organization designated by the County Council and approved by the County Executive
<i>Purpose</i>	“[T]o ensure the implementation of a local interagency service delivery system for children, youth, and families.” ⁴¹
<i>Duties and Responsibilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in community planning for services for children, youth and families, including developing a 5-year strategic plan for the County; • Apply for and administer public and private funds for children’s programs, including maintaining standards of accountability; • Work with partners to eliminate fragmentation and duplication of services for children, youth and families; and • Create a system of services, supports and opportunities that improve outcomes for children, youth and families.
<i>Board Composition</i>	The Board of Directors must have 21 voting members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council, including 12 public sector members, designated by specified public officials, and 9 private sector members that can include advocates, service providers, parents, young adults, business owners and community leaders.
<i>Accountability Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Collaboration Council must submit quarterly and annual financial reports to the Executive, Council, and Board of Education; and • The Collaboration Council must submit an annual report of its operations and accomplishments, including outcomes, objectives, performance measures, and evaluation of effectiveness to the Executive, Council, and Board of Education.

³⁹ “MCC” refers to the Montgomery County Code

⁴⁰ The Collaboration Council is Montgomery County’s Local Management Board as defined in State law and the County Code

⁴¹ MD Code, Human Services, Ann. § 8-301

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation (MCEDC)	
<i>Defining Law or Resolution</i>	MCC Chapter 15A
<i>Type of Organization</i>	Nonprofit corporation designated by the County Council and approved by the County Executive
<i>Purpose</i>	“[T]o implement the County’s economic development programs and activities.” ⁴²
<i>Duties and Responsibilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work to attract and retain businesses; • Promote development of new businesses; • Facilitate economic, industrial, and commercial development; • Encourage investment; • Promote job growth and talent attraction; • Advise County officials on economic development matters; • Provide services to County businesses to maintain and grow the existing economic base; • Stimulate and nurture the development of new business; • Support minority, female, and disabled owned businesses; and • Promote the development of a vital and balanced economy.⁴³
<i>Board Composition</i>	The MCEDC’s Board of Directors must have 11 voting members appointed by the County Executive and confirmed by the County Council, including a member of the Workforce Development Board. The Board must also have three non-voting members: one appointed by the County Executive, one by the County Council and one by the Maryland Secretary of Commerce.
<i>Accountability Measures</i>	The MCEDC must submit an annual report on its activities and finances to the Executive and County Council, including data on the MCEDC’s microlending program (including the number of microloans issued, loan repayments received, the rate of repayment, and non-County funds that support the program).

⁴² MCC § 15A-1

⁴³ MCC § 15A-4

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Arts and Humanities Council of Montgomery County (AHC MC)	
<i>Defining Law or Resolution</i>	MCC Chapter 5A
<i>Type of Organization</i>	Nonprofit organization designated by the County Council
<i>Purpose</i>	“[T]o develop, promote, advocate, and coordinate efforts to support, investigate, encourage, and present arts and humanities in the County.” ⁴⁴
<i>Duties and Responsibilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote and support the arts and humanities; • Coordinate and provide funding for the arts and humanities; • Advise local, State, and Federal agencies about the needs of arts and humanities programs in Montgomery County; • Report annually to the County Council, the County Executive and the public on the AHC MC’s activities and the state of the arts and humanities in Montgomery County; and • Coordinate AHC MC activities with other government programs.⁴⁵
<i>Board Composition</i>	<p>The County Code does not specify how many directors the AHC MC must have on its governing board or its selection process, but does require that membership on the board be nonpartisan, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private individuals and organizations with knowledge of or interest in the arts and humanities; • Practicing artists and writers, both professional and amateur; • Scholars, researchers and civic cultural leaders; • The various disciplines in the arts and humanities; • The general public, including ethnic, racial, linguistic, and cultural minorities; and • Geographic balance of where members live or work. <p>AHC MC’s most recent tax documents list 15 members of the governing board, in addition to the organization’s Chief Executive Officer.</p>
<i>Accountability Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AHC MC must provide the County with regular financial reports, including an annual independent audit; and • The AHC MC must provide an annual report to the Executive, Council, and public on its operations and activities (including how these activities affect underserved or underrepresented populations), along with the state of the arts and humanities in the County.

⁴⁴ MCC § 5A-3

⁴⁵ MCC § 5A-6

Children’s Trusts and County-Designated Nonprofit Entities

Montgomery Coalition for Adult English Literacy (MCAEL)	
<i>Defining Law or Resolution</i>	Council Resolution 15-558
<i>Type of Organization</i>	Nonprofit organization that has been awarded a recurring contract with the County.
<i>Purpose</i>	“[T]o leverage private and public monies to enhance the capacity of Adult ESL ⁴⁶ providers in the county.” ⁴⁷
<i>Duties and Responsibilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain a database of ESL providers, teachers, advocates and advocacy groups and make an electronic provider directory available to the community; • Notify ESL providers of funding and grants opportunities, national and state policy issues, best practices and professional development opportunities; • Administer grants to ESL providers; • Measure the quality and effectiveness of ESL service delivery by grantees; and • Provide networking meetings for ESL providers.
<i>Board Composition</i>	Neither the Council resolution supporting the creation of MCAEL, nor MCAEL’s contract with Montgomery County, specify the composition of MCAEL’s Board of Directors or how they are selected. MCAEL’s most recent tax documents list 11 members of the Board of Directors, in addition to the organization’s Executive Director.
<i>Accountability Measures</i>	The County Code does not include specific requirements for MCAEL, though the MCAEL’s contract with the County includes reporting and other requirements.

⁴⁶ ESL stands for English as a Second Language

⁴⁷ CR 15-558