North Carolina Entities Receiving Grant Funds for Services for Children

Purpose: To fulfill the Council's first charge of mapping the network of child-serving agencies and organizations in the State

Methodology: The Program Evaluation Division searched the Office of State Budget and Management's (OSBM) Grants Management databases for grant program descriptions containing any of the following words: child, family, families, infant, minor, or youth. The Program Evaluation Division contacted all 40 state agencies and institutions to verify whether each agency's grant programs were correctly identified as ones providing goods, services, or public assistance with the specific aim of enhancing the health, safety, or well-being of children, youth, or their families. Several entities provided additional grant programs not contained in OSBM's database.

Based on this criteria, state agencies and institutions identified 53 grant programs. The Program Evaluation Division surveyed the programs to gather data on the populations they serve, the types of services they provide, the locations where their services are available, and management practices. The survey had a 94% response rate, with three grant programs not responding to the survey.

For programs eligible for inclusion in both the Children Council's Program Inventory and its Grant Inventory, agencies were given the choice of where the program should appear in order to prevent duplication across the two inventories.

Work Product: The complete inventory, including recipients of grant awards, can be found online at https://www.ncleg.gov/ProgramEvaluation/ChildCouncil/GrantInventory. Website users can filter by keyword and agency or download the entire dataset for their own analyses.

In addition, the Program Evaluation Division aggregated survey data into summary tables.

- **Amount Spent.** Table 1 shows that in State Fiscal Year 2018–19, 12 agencies had 53 grant programs serving children, youth, and families with total spending of $52.7 million.
- **Agency, Target Population, and Primary Activity.**
    - Table 2 shows the majority of grant programs are in the university system. The majority of grant programs are in the Education and Life Skills domain.
    - Table 3 shows the primary target population of most grant programs is youth from ages 6-15, followed by transitional youth age 16 and over.
    - Table 4 shows the most prevalent primary activity performed by grant programs is direct or indirect services (such as healthcare, childcare), followed by educational services.
- **Best Practices.**
    - Table 5 shows the majority of grant programs are not using an evidence-based or best practice model.
    - Table 6 shows the majority of grant programs do not receive or provide training on trauma.
    - Table 7 shows the majority of grant programs have a logic model, which is a visual guide that shows how a program's resources are translated into outcomes.

- Table 8 shows the type of performance measures collected by grant programs. Descriptive measures (such as participant demographics) and output measures (such as number of participants) are the most common. Fewer grant programs are collecting outcome and efficiency measures.

- Oversight.
  - Table 9 shows the majority of grant programs are evaluated by an internal or external entity (e.g., the State Auditor's Office).
  - Table 10 shows a little more than half of grant programs have some reporting requirements to either the state or federal government or both.
- Partnerships and Contractors.
  - Table 11 shows the majority of grant programs use partnerships.
  - Table 12 shows the majority of grant programs do not use contractors and instead rely solely on agency staff.
- Duplication.
  - Table 13 shows the majority of grant programs do not know if their recipients are involved with other programs.
  - Table 14 shows the majority of grant programs engage in efforts to ensure services are not duplicated by other programs.
- Location.
  - Table 15 shows few grant programs are provided statewide, or in every county.
  - Table 16 shows the number of grant programs by domain and county.

Amount Spent

Table 1. Amount Spent by Agency on Grant Programs

Agency	Number of Grant Programs	Total Amount Spent in State Fiscal Year 2018–19
Agriculture & Consumer Services	2	$ 1,404,764
Environmental Quality	1	141,385
Natural & Cultural Resources	1	0
Public Instruction	7	26,911,767
Public Safety	3	8,338,924
State Budget and Management	17	5,223,176
Transportation	1	0
University	21	10,664,953
Total	**53**	**$ 52,684,970**

Note: Grant programs may have expenditures of $0 for State Fiscal Year 2018–19 because the program existed but did not have expenditures within that year for any number of reasons, such as awaiting grant close-out, being a newly established grant program, or not having been deleted from the State's database.

Agency, Target Population, and Primary Activity

Table 2. Number of Grant Programs by Agency and Domain								
	Child & Maternal Health	Childcare/ Pre-K	Child Safety & Welfare	Education & Life Skills	Family Support	Juvenile Justice	MH, SA, & Early Intervention	Total
Universities	2		1	18				**21**
State Budget and Management		1	1	10	2		1	**15**
Public Instruction	2		1	3	1			**7**
Public Safety						2	1	**3**
Agriculture & Consumer Services	1			1				**2**
Environmental Quality					1			**1**
Natural and Cultural Resources				1				**1**
Transportation					1			**1**
Total	**5**	**1**	**3**	**33**	**5**	**2**	**2**	**51**

Note: MH stands for Mental Health. SA stands for Substance Abuse. Two programs did not respond to the survey and thus are not included in this table.

Table 3. Number of Grant Programs by Primary Target Population	
Youth: ages 6 – 15	24
Families (including expectant parent, parents, or legal guardians)	5
Transitional Age Youth: ages 16+	15
Children: ages prenatal – 5	0
Service provider	7
Did not respond	2
Total	**53**

Table 4. Number of Grant Programs by Primary Activity	
Provides direct or indirect services (e.g., healthcare, childcare, inspections, case management, classes/sessions, counseling, referrals, consultations)	30
Provides educational services	12
Provides goods (e.g., wheelchairs, cochlear implants)	5
Provides system improvement (e.g., policy, provider networking, quality improvement)	2
Develops physical infrastructure (e.g., buildings, technology)	2
Provides public assistance/subsidy (e.g., Medicaid, Health Choice, WIC)	0
Did not respond	2
Total	**53**

Best Practices

Table 5. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) That Use Evidence-Based or Best Practice Model	
No	27 (51%)
Yes	19 (36%)
Missing	5 (9%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 6. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) that Receive and Provide Training on Trauma	
Do not receive or provide training	39 (74%)
Receive training	7 (13%)
Receive and provide training	2 (4%)
Missing	2 (4%)
Provide training	1 (2%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 7. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) with Logic Models	
Yes	31 (58%)
Not sure/other/missing	16 (30%)
No	4 (8%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 8. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) Collecting At Least One Performance Measure	
Descriptive measures (e.g., participant demographics, expenditures)	39 (76%)
Output measures (e.g., number of participants enrolled, time in program)	38 (75%)
Outcome measures (e.g., participant satisfaction, outcome assessments)	28 (55%)
Efficiency/process measures (e.g., return on investment, cost per participant)	21 (41%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Note: Total value is not applicable because each program may have more than one form of measure. Programs not responding were excluded from the percentage of programs collecting each type of measure.	

Oversight

Table 9. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) with Evaluations Conducted	
Yes	38 (72%)
No	13 (25%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 10. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) with Reporting Requirements	
Report to state government only	16 (30%)
Report to federal and state government	7 (13%)
Report to federal government only	14 (26%)
No reporting requirements	9 (17%)
Missing	5 (9%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Partnerships and Contractors

Table 11. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) Using Partnerships	
Yes	40 (75%)
No	4 (8%)
Not sure	2 (4%)
Missing	5 (9%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 12. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) Using Contractors	
Use agency staff and contractors	22 (42%)
Do not use contractors	21 (40%)
Use contractors only	3 (6%)
Missing	5 (9%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Duplication

Table 13. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) that Know if Recipients Are Involved with Other Programs	
No	21 (40%)
Yes	13 (25%)
Not sure/Other	12 (23%)
Missing	5 (9%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 14. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) that Engage in Efforts to Ensure Services Are Not Duplicated by Other Programs	
Yes	22 (42%)
No	13 (25%)
Not sure/Other	11 (21%)
Missing	5 (9%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Locations

Table 15. Number of Grant Programs (Percentage) that Provide Services Statewide	
Yes	10 (19%)
No	41 (77%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)
Total	**53 (100%)**

Table 16. Number of Grant Programs by County and Domain

County	Child & Maternal Health	Childcare/ Pre-K	Child Safety & Welfare	Education & Life Skills	Family Support	Juvenile Justice	MH, SA, & Early Intervention	Total
Alamance	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Alexander	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Alleghany	2	0	2	5	3	2	1	15
Anson	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Ashe	1	0	2	5	3	2	1	14
Avery	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	13
Beaufort	2	0	1	4	3	2	1	13
Bertie	3	0	1	4	3	2	1	14
Bladen	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Brunswick	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Buncombe	2	0	2	3	3	2	1	13
Burke	1	0	2	4	3	2	1	13
Cabarrus	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Caldwell	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Camden	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Carteret	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Caswell	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Catawba	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10

Table 16. Number of Grant Programs by County and Domain								
County	Child & Maternal Health	Childcare/ Pre-K	Child Safety & Welfare	Education & Life Skills	Family Support	Juvenile Justice	MH, SA, & Early Intervention	Total
Chatham	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Cherokee	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12
Chowan	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Clay	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Cleveland	3	0	1	2	3	2	1	12
Columbus	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Craven	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Cumberland	3	0	1	10	3	2	1	20
Currituck	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Dare	1	0	1	4	3	2	2	13
Davidson	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Davie	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Duplin	2	0	1	4	3	2	1	13
Durham	2	0	1	5	3	2	1	14
Edgecombe	3	0	1	5	3	2	1	15
Forsyth	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Franklin	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Gaston	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Gates	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Graham	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12
Granville	2	0	1	4	3	2	1	13
Greene	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	12
Guilford	2	0	1	4	4	2	1	14
Halifax	3	0	1	3	3	2	1	13
Harnett	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	13
Haywood	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12
Henderson	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Hertford	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Hoke	1	0	1	6	3	2	1	14
Hyde	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Iredell	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Jackson	2	0	2	3	3	2	1	13
Johnston	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Jones	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Lee	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Lenoir	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	13
Lincoln	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Macon	1	0	2	2	3	2	1	11
Madison	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Martin	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11

Table 16. Number of Grant Programs by County and Domain								
County	Child & Maternal Health	Childcare/ Pre-K	Child Safety & Welfare	Education & Life Skills	Family Support	Juvenile Justice	MH, SA, & Early Intervention	Total
McDowell	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12
Mecklenburg	3	0	1	3	3	2	1	13
Mitchell	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12
Montgomery	2	0	1	2	4	2	1	12
Moore	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Nash	2	0	1	4	3	2	1	13
New Hanover	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Northampton	2	0	1	2	3	2	1	11
Onslow	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Orange	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Pamlico	2	0	1	4	3	2	1	13
Pasquotank	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Pender	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Perquimans	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Person	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Pitt	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	13
Polk	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Randolph	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Richmond	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Robeson	3	0	1	7	3	2	1	17
Rockingham	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Rowan	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Rutherford	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Sampson	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12
Scotland	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12
Stanly	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12
Stokes	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12
Surry	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12
Swain	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12
Transylvania	2	0	2	3	3	2	1	13
Tyrrell	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Union	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Vance	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12
Wake	3	0	1	3	3	2	1	13
Warren	2	0	1	3	3	2	1	12
Washington	1	0	1	3	3	2	1	11
Watauga	1	0	2	5	3	2	1	14
Wayne	1	0	1	5	3	2	1	13
Wilkes	2	0	2	5	3	2	1	15
Wilson	1	0	1	4	3	2	1	12

Table 16. Number of Grant Programs by County and Domain								
County	Child & Maternal Health	Childcare/ Pre-K	Child Safety & Welfare	Education & Life Skills	Family Support	Juvenile Justice	MH, SA, & Early Intervention	Total
Yadkin	1	0	1	2	3	2	1	10
Yancey	1	0	2	3	3	2	1	12