

**Public Service Grant Council - Best Practices Meeting**

**Date: August 31, 2009**

**Time: 10:08 AM**

**Present:** Alberta Hipps, Arnold Tritt, Ronald Mallett and John Donahoo

**Staff Present:** Roslyn Phillips, Nancy Kirts, John Snyder, Sandy Arts, Sue Andrews and Linda Platte'

**Welcome:** Alberta Hipps welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming to participate in the Best Practices Meeting. She facilitated introductions of all Public Service Grant Council members and staff.

**Non-Profit's recommendations**

Alberta Hipps presented hand-outs to everyone regarding the funding methodology recommendations from members of the Non-Profit Center dated June 2, 2009. There were three (3) concerns articulated.

**1. Concern – “Funding Instructions to applicants; Statement of funding advantage to those programs requesting increases in their funding. Statement of “sets a precedent for agencies to ask for the maximum amount of funding in the future, regardless of need, to soften the blow of across-the-board paring.” They suggested suspending the grant allocations made at May 19, 2009 Public Service Grant Council meeting.**

**Alberta Hipps' response to Concern #1:**

- Applicants should apply for funds based on the needs they have identified.
- Public Service Grants only will support 24% of an organization's revenue, so funding is limited.
- The Public Service Grant Council treated every organization consistently in terms of funding. Chapter 118 provides no authority to treat organizations differently when it comes to funding.
- Future mandatory training sessions will be taped recorded in an effort to create transparency.
- There are no plans to suspend the allocations made at May 19, 2009 Public Service Grant Council meeting. She will continue to look at research for Best Practices going forward.

**2. Concern – Budget Recommendation not a reflection of need**

**Alberta Hipps' response to Concern #2:** The need for funding the non-profit sector has been articulated to the Public Service Grant Council and the process we are operating under now is:

- Chapter 118 which is specific when it comes to the process the Public Service Grant Council should follow. Section 118.206 states: “Allocation of lump sum appropriation to applicant organization shall be made by the Public Service Grant Council. A complete list of the individual operating amounts and capital amounts will be forwarded to the Mayor for processing and assignment of monitoring Divisions.” To reverse this process can be considered. The Public Service Grant Council is a volunteer organization and not prepared to do extensive lobbying. Changes to Chapter 118 would have to be made to change the current process

**3. Concern – Qualitative Evaluation Criteria Needed**

**Alberta Hipps response to Concern #3:**

- The application scoring criteria has been made public at the mandatory training as well as being posted on the Public Service Grants web site.
- The site visit grading criteria is also shared with each Public Service Grant organization and a mandatory training to address each grading criteria is also provided. This form is used once the organization has received a Public Service Grant. We are currently developing a site visit tool that will be used during the FY 2011 funding process. It will be shared and discussed during mandatory training.
- Every effort has been made to ensure transparency on all levels. This effort will continue.

**Other ideas:**

**Create an advisory board to help develop best practices.**

**Alberta Hipps' response:** Engagement of Public Service Grant Council in progress with non-profits underway.

**Increase the number of Public Service Grant Council members.**

**Alberta Hipps' response:** Mayoral appointees have an excellent record of engagement of members to date and indicate a willingness to do the work needed for application reviews and site visits.

**Extend training opportunities to grants staff in nonprofit outcomes measurement and effective grant-making practices through local private foundations**

**Alberta Hipps' response:** She will pursue.

**Consider how to prevent extreme scores from having an exaggerated influence on aggregate.**

**Alberta Hipps' response:** She will research and implement method in the future.

**Put in place better communication for receipt of audits in timely manner between Public Service Grant Council office and City Council auditor.**

**Alberta Hipps' response:** She has discussed this concern and a better process being developed. Ms. Hipps asked Nancy Kirts to discuss more in detail about what the Council Auditor's Office wants the staff to review the audits. Ms. Kirts said that the requirement for audit is in each executed contract and that an audit is required for City of Jacksonville funding over \$100,000. The audit is due within 120 days of an agency's fiscal year ending. If the audit is given to the staff late, then the Council Auditor's Office will receive the audit late. Ronald Mallett asked if the Public Service Grant Council had approved changes regarding audits being submitted two (2) weeks prior to the 120 day deadline. Ms. Kirts suggested that this information could be placed in future contracts.

**Consider whether 3 minute presentations are good use of Public Service Grant Council's time.**

**Alberta Hipps' response:** She will consider this going forward. Ronald Mallett stated that it had been suggested that the Public Service Grant Council establish a point value for Oral Presentations for FY 2011. Ms. Hipps, along with John Donahoo agreed to implement this suggestion for FY 2011.

**Best Practices Overview of Research**

John Snyder did research regarding Best Practices and found out that there were a lot of city government and agencies that grant out funds to non-profit organizations.

### Best Practices Presentation

John Snyder provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Public Service Grant Council detailing Best Practices of governmental and non-profit agencies. Mr. Snyder began with Orlando, Florida that has a Mayor's Faith-Based & Community Matching Grant that begins after budget is approved. The City of Miami has a Continuation Allocation to Community-Based Organizations which has a closed application process. Miami also has a Competitive Allocation to Community-Based Organizations using an RFP process. They also have a Community Based volunteer Organization Board. The City of Tampa has a competitive grant process using an RFP process. United Way of NE Florida has a closed application process. All applications are scored at the end of the review process. The City of Jacksonville, Community Development Block Grants is similar to the Public Service Grant process. The Jacksonville Children's Commission has a competitive grant process using an RFP. They also have non-competitive renewal grants where contracts are awarded through renewals. The Cultural Council of Greater Jacksonville has a screening and scoring process. They assign grants on three levels based on available funding with equal percentage for each level.

Ms. Hipps asked Roslyn Phillips to give her thoughts regarding the Public Service Grants allocation process. Ms. Phillips stated as part of the City's Charter, the City of Jacksonville is required to provide service that benefits the welfare of the Jacksonville's citizens. For that reason, the City of Jacksonville provides funding to the Behavioral and Human Services Division to help people in need. That funding goes to non-profit organizations to provide for the welfare/well-being of citizens through various human service programs. That funding is about \$17 million dollars and is administered through renewable contracts.

Deleted: Example of that is Gateway - Detox.

Ms. Hipps opened the meeting to public comments. **Ellen Siler**, Hubbard House stated - (1) she would like to see a cap on all increases; (2) Establish a cap on annual requests considering that this year agencies asked for 300% or greater increases and ended up with 70-80% higher increase to their previous years funding that will carry forward the disparity each year; (3) a 5% cap on new organizations and then only 10% each year after and it will be a long time before they catch up with other agencies that have been here for a long time. **Sandy Faraldo**, Private Grant Consultant - Stated that programs can only project funding for those that are already funded. Ms. Faraldo stated she was looking at program growth and development by allowing for a longer contract process, so that agencies would not have to go through the grant process every year. Ronald Mallett explained to her that Chapter 118 states that the money has to be spent within the fiscal year and then the grant process begins all over again. Ms. Hipps also stated that the Public Service Grant Council doesn't know what the budget is until City Council approves the funding. **Jan Morris**, United Way - They don't know either what their pool of dollars for funding for United Way is either. They look annually at everyone's budgets and outcomes, along with site visits. Funding is reviewed every year. **Dawn Gilman**, Emergency Services and Homeless Coalition - wanted to advise that Public Service grants are used as leverage for cash match of Federal grant dollars.

Ronald Mallett asked if he could elaborate on some of the things that John Snyder had talked about. He likes the staff scoring the applications, but feels it shouldn't influence the Public Service Grant Council's funding methodology. John Donahoo stated how to handle non-compliance should be understood clearly so there won't be any misunderstanding in FY 2011. Ms. Hipps asked to review the minutes of meeting for clarity. **(See Below)**

**Public Service Grant Council Meeting Minutes for May 7, 2009.** Ms. Hipps asked Lawsikia Hodges for her opinion about the Council Auditor's Non-Compliant List. Lawsikia Hodges stated that she had researched and discussed this with other lawyers and recommended that the Public Service Grant Council take some time and go through the Chapter 118 changes. She stated that some of the problems with Chapter 118 are that it references Public Service Grant Appropriations and then Miscellaneous Appropriations. She asked if there was a distinction between those two terms and Nancy Kirts answered, yes. In Chapter 118.503, it states "A recipient failing to comply with requirements of this Chapter shall be ineligible to apply for a miscellaneous appropriation for the next fiscal year". She suggested that the wording should be changed by City Council for future funding to include Public Service Grant funding.

Roslyn Phillips stated that the staff should only be screening the applications to ensure the mandatory requirements have been met. The application scoring is the responsibility of the Public Service Grant Council per Chapter 118. Alberta Hipps stated that she had been invited to review the Cultural Council's grant making process with Mr. Bob White and Ms. Lanahan. She received a notebook of information detailing their process. Ms. Hipps asked to have a subcommittee to look further into Best Practices. Ronald Mallett agreed to chair this subcommittee along with staff support. Ms. Hipps stated she would like for this process to be completed before the mandatory Public Service Grant training process begins in December.

**Meeting Adjourned**

**Time: 11:45 AM**

**Minutes Prepared by: Linda Platte'**