



COMMUNITY BENEFITS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Monday, January 9, 2023

4:00 PM – 6:00 PM

Virtual Meeting

Overview

The Community Benefits Advisory Committee (CBAC) will meet to advance its purpose to act on the Guiding Principles for Community Benefits Funding set forth in the Community Needs Assessment.

I. Welcome and Introduction

II. Minutes and Updates

CBAC members present approved minutes from previous meetings:

- December 05, 2022

III. CBAC: Where we are & how we might proceed in the months ahead

[slide 4]

January 2023

- Partnerships submit Year 3 progress check-ins to CBAC
- [CBAC January 9 meeting] CBAC reviews and discusses Year 3 Partnership progress check-ins, identifies any follow-up questions, and affirms that each Partnership is on track to receive Year 4 funding
- Collaborative planning session with Partnerships and HRiA to generate and identify opportunities for Year 4 aligned with CBAC's goals

February 2023

- [CBAC February 6 meeting] Finalize guidance to and questions for Partnerships about Year 4 plan submission
- Partnerships submit Year 4 plans to CBAC

March 2023

- [CBAC March 6 meeting] Review and discuss Year 4 plans and affirm Year 4 recommendations
- March 17: Year 4 begins

IV. Partnerships: Year 3 progress

Questions about Year 3 progress to support CBAC's decisions about eligibility for Year 4 funding

[slide 5]

Guidance to Partnerships:

- *Please respond to all questions as a Partnership, and please indicate if there are features unique to an individual partner*
 - *Please respond to each sub-question in no more than 300 words, and bulleted responses are fine*
 - *CBAC intends to share responses across Partnerships and with HRiA*
 - *Your submission may become a public document*
 - *CBAC will review and discuss at the CBAC meeting on January 9, and provide you with follow-up questions shortly thereafter, should any emerge*
1. Considering the plan your Partnership presented in March 2022, please provide an update on where you are in meeting your goals. Please include:
 - Where and how your Partnership is on track to meet your Year 3 goals, as you articulated them in March 2022?
 - Where and how your Partnership is not on track to meet your Year 3 goals - and why?

- What are you doing differently than anticipated and how did this change impact your Year 3 goals?
 - What else should CBAC know about where you expect to be by the end of Year 3 (March 2023) in making progress toward these goals?
2. Please affirm your Partnership's commitment to continuing to work with HRiA to complete all evaluation activities and qualitative and quantitative data collection by the end of Year 3 (March 2023):
This includes follow-up with Partnership and Systems Level data (PARTNER tool, Organizational Capacity Survey, Partnership Qualitative interviews and focus groups) and follow-up Family Level Survey collection with families that have participated to date.
- If you anticipate being unable to collect all data for Year 3, please explain why

[slide 6]

Review each Partnership's submission to determine eligibility for Year 4 funding:

- **Families Moving Forward** (cohort model)
Bridges Homeward (formerly Cambridge Family and Children's Service), Cambridge Health Alliance, Cambridge Housing Authority, Community Action Agency of Somerville, Institute of Health and Recovery, *Just-A-Start*
- **Family Stability Project**
Cambridge Economic Opportunity Commission, *De Novo*, Transition House
- **Port Arise Institute** (cohort model)
Community Art Center, Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House, Tutoring Plus
- **Strengthening Families Together Project**
Cambridge Community Center, East End House, org formerly known as Agassiz Baldwin Community

Questions to consider in your review:

- Provided continued demonstration of reasonable progress toward meeting the goals the Partnership set in its modified plan submitted for Year 3, is there anything that gives you pause about this Partnership's eligibility for Year 4 funding?
- What question(s), if any, does CBAC need the Partnership to answer to be able to make a determination about its eligibility for Year 4?

Across the Partnerships' submissions: What else do you notice? What questions do you have for CBAC to consider as we look to the end of Year 3 and start of Year 4?

CBAC discussion

Families Moving Forward

- Group appears on track with goals, making solid progress, and their response is thorough and complete
- Interesting to read through their goals – some read as specific and measurable (SMART-E), some seem read as more process-oriented and looser
 - If we are going to ask for goals, we may want to define and spell out more clearly what we mean
 - And process-oriented goals are important, too
- How their outcomes are shaping up are resonant with what they have shared previously
- I am noticing that they are compensating participants for survey completion, which makes sense and hadn't noticed previously – and another Partnership is taking the same approach
 - It seems that they were not getting feedback in the specific way they had set up to receive it
- They've projected a definitive end date with their participants – and then working to support participants' transition
 - CBAC affirmation – Partnership is eligible for Year 4 funding

Family Stability Project

- I am not convinced that they answered all questions – notably bullets 3 and 4 under question 1
- Their model seems to be one of crisis intervention – which is different and more short-term than stabilizing families and helping them move up the economic ladder; I am impressed by the numbers they have served and the target population – they have concrete accomplishments
- It is a large population served, yet they provide the least information
 - FSP Year 3 Goal: "As with Years 1 and 2, the Family Stability Project will provide wraparound, direct services to 150-175 Cambridge families with children that are low-income or living in poverty, with priority given to single female headed households.... In addition, the project will deliver 6-8 trainings for client-eligible families and provide 4-6 trainings to housing providers, community providers, and partner staff"

- What are they measuring about the services they provide? What is their back-up information?
- It would be useful to have them breakdown in greater detail the data in their response – i.e., “276 Cambridge families” and “729 individual community members”
- Is what they have provided us responsive to what we asked for? I don’t doubt that we think this group should be funded – and, on principle, ask them for additional information
 - Convey to them something to the effect of, “We know you are doing great work, and we had some confusion about the information provided in paragraph 2, and we want to understand better the difference in numbers, the service(s) provided, and what they are projecting for Year 3...”
 - CBAC affirmation – Partnership is on track to be eligible for Year 4 funding with continued progress in Year 3, and we have some additional questions that will help CBAC’s understanding of their progress:
- Request that they address bullets 3 and 4 in question 1, or clarify how their response addressed them, and ask for additional context for their numbers:
 - How does the number of families (276) relate to the number of individual community members (729)?
 - What support(s) did they provide the 729 individual community members
 - How many families received which kind of services?
 - What number of trainings did they deliver/ do they anticipate delivering by the end of Year 3, as compared to their goal?

Port Arise Institute

- I am not seeing much about the cohort model – it seems each partner might be doing more of their own thing
- I love that they keep building collaborations, and it is unclear if the three partners are building these together
- From our meeting with each Partnership during the spring/summer, this was the Partnership who was very much working together through their shared caseworker/advocate
- It is hard to get from this response what is happening with the casework across organizations, and they have morphed a lot – they have peeled back the proposed community initiative more and more, and the community/ group work has changed
- It would be helpful to understand more about the work of the Port Family Advocate, and more detail about what the casework entails within and/or across each of the three cohorts
 - CBAC affirmation – Partnership is on track to be eligible for Year 4 funding with continued progress in Year 3, and we have some additional questions that will help CBAC’s understanding of their progress:
- It would be helpful to understand more about the work of the Port Family Advocate, and receive more detail about what the casework entails across within and/or across each of the three cohorts

Strengthening Families Together Project

- I was surprised by the first sentence – that the model is still in its formative phase
- I am wondering about the status of the family-level survey, and the numbers in their response to question 2 – as of the last Evaluation meeting with HRiA, we haven’t received surveys from one partner
 - HRiA will check on this
- If two of the three partners have family-level survey data, and one hasn’t, what does that mean?
 - Did we indicate that each partner needed to collect surveys, or the Partnership as a whole? Are we tracking the number of surveys per Partnership or per partners?
 - With other Partnerships, there is a single partner providing all family-level surveys – it is not partner-specific
 - With this Partnership, each partner committed to collecting a certain number of surveys over a certain period
- This Partnership provides a lot of information about staff training – and I am wondering how this training is translating to families, the services provided to them, and the effects
- Across the 4 models, Partnerships are tracking families in different ways – we really have to figure out how they will tell their stories; how to convey how nonprofits respond to what is happening in the community and what interventions can make a difference for families?
 - CBAC affirmation – Partnership is on track to be eligible for Year 4 funding with continued progress in Year 3, and we have some additional questions that will help CBAC’s understanding of their progress:
- How is the training for staff translating to families, the services provided to them, and the effects?

V. HRIA: Update on evaluation process

[slide 7]

What we know:

- HRIA does not have capacity for and does not recommend continuing full evaluation of Year 4, particularly family-level data collection
- Family-level survey data collection has had, and will continue to have, diminishing returns

What HRIA wants to know:

- What are the questions about and/ or outcomes for Year 4 that might require evaluation?
- Who are the audience(s) for the evaluation and how might that impact what is analyzed in Year 4?

A proposal:

- End family-level survey collection at the end of Year 3, in March 2023 (with a couple of months buffer, as needed/ wanted)
- HRIA begins analysis of full 3 years of data, such that it is complete and can be presented with sufficient time that CBAC + Partnerships can review together and allow time for some planning by and with Partnerships in the latter half of Year 4
- Continue process evaluation with Partnerships - that wraps up in latter half of Year 4 so that it can also be reviewed by CBAC + Partnerships

CBAC discussion:

- It is important to be clear what would be helpful, and what do we want to learn? To what extent might we want technical assistance or strategic planning for Partnerships?
- Under the proposal, it seems like the first bullet is about getting a deeper understanding of families, the second is about a deeper understanding of the Community Benefits process overall – what worked and what didn't, both for CBAC and broader community, and the third piece should be about benefiting the Partnerships – to integrate learnings into their current work, raise more money, etc.
- Does “analysis” mean interpretation and lessons learned? Will we be using the information we have in Year 3 to inform what we have in Year 4?
 - Yes – HRIA will be doing interpretation as part of its analysis
- It is really important to help organizations off-board participating families well, so that all the work of these years does not fizzle out
- And we will want to broadcast that to Partnerships – focus on their capacity, stories, models, and more funding
- Instead of process evaluation, maybe we want HRIA working in a custom way with each Partnership – focusing on their models, other funding, transitioning of families, learning from and applying evaluation results
 - Review of evaluation report and then process assistance in transitioning to something else both for participants and the models
- If possible to do all, continue process evaluation for Year 4, support Partnerships in reviewing and applying learnings from evaluation and transitioning beyond Year 4, and also making recommendations for next steps with Community Benefits funding

VI. Next Steps & Next Meeting Dates

Collaborative Year 4 planning session with CBAC and Partnerships:

- Thursday, January 19, 3:30pm – 5:30pm

Next CAB meetings:

- Monday, February 6
- Monday, March 6

VII. Public Comment

- No member of the public was present during the public comment period

VIII. Attendance

Committee Members Present: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caleb Hurst-Hiller • Elizabeth Aguilo • Ellen Semonoff • Geeta Pradhan • Michelle Lower • Paul Parravano • Rowan Murphy • Sandra Clarke • Taha Jennings 	Committee Members Absent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amal Mohamed • Maria LaPage
	Community Development Department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lev McCarthy
	Facilitator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daniel Michaud Weinstock, dmw360 consulting
	Health Resources in Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nicole Robertson