

Public Service Grant Council Best Practice Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: October 6, 2009

Time: 10:20 a.m.

Present: Ronald Mallett, Arnold Tritt, John Donahoo and Edgar Mathis

Staff Present: Nancy Kirts, John Snyder, Sandy Arts, Sue Andrews, Linda Platte' and Lawsikia Hodges, Office of General Counsel.

Welcome: Ronald Mallett welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions.

FY 2011 Application Grading Criteria – Ronald Mallett stated that the purpose of this meeting was to give everyone some insight into to what the Sub-committee was trying accomplish with future funding methodologies.

Scoring Instructions Overview

Ronald Mallett stated what he'd like to establish a point system that defines weighted point values for grading categories using input from meeting attendees. In addition, he would like to develop a procedure that would help evaluate applications effectively.

Viability of Site Visits

Ronald Mallett stated that by ordinance the Public Service Grant Council was required to do site visits. Each Public Service Grant Council Member has 7 site visits to complete. He asked if points should be assessed by each Public Service Grant Council member for the site visits they complete since it would reflect only one person's review. Arnold Tritt asked Nancy Kirts if anyone had reviewed the grading system that Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) uses. Nancy Kirts advised that John Snyder could answer that question. John Snyder stated that at the August 31, 2009 Public Service Grant Council meeting, Best Practices were discussed and the system CDBG uses was discussed. An in-depth grading process is not used by CDBG in comparison with what the Public Service Grant Council has used. Mr. Mallett asked if Oral Presentations should be graded. Edgar Mathis made the point that in some cases a person could be great at public speeches whereas another presenter just provides the facts. Edger Mathis also stated that he feels Oral Presentations should not be scored, and felt the major emphasis should be placed on whether the program has accomplished its goals and objectives. Ronald Mallett asked John Snyder, what cities out of his research do RFP's instead of Public Service Grants. John Snyder stated that Orlando, Miami and Tampa do RFP's and that they partner with other agencies to provide contracted services. Edgar Mathis stated that when an organization providing services in all five priority population areas, it makes it difficult to effectively evaluate the proposed grant program. Ronald Mallett stated that the Public Service Grant Council should require the organization with multiple priorities to prepare a grant application for

each. Edgar Mathis stated that it would make the Public Service Grant Council's job easier to evaluate grant applications by priority populations. Dawn Gilman, Emergency Services and Homeless Coalition stated that there is a small group of Public Service Grant recipients, who provide essential services, and that if they went away, the City would have to provide those services. Lawsikia Hodges stated that in Chapter 118.203 (c), "Unless determined that the program performs an essential function otherwise required to be performed by the City, a Public Service Grant cannot account for more than 24% of the recipient's annual revenue averaged over the three previous years". She went on to say that there is a clear mandate that "all recipients must operate programs that will effect and improve the priority population". A Public Service Grant must serve a Priority Population first. Providing an essential function is secondary to meeting that requirement. Ju'Coby Pittman-Peele, Clara White Mission, Inc. stated that the Cultural Council has a funding method that works. They know their total funding allocation amount to begin the process and they have funding levels 1, 2 and 3. The grading panel completes site visits with each of the applicant organizations. Once the panel completes the site visit, all panelists receive share their results. The day of the final applicant review, the only additional information accepted are updates from the site visits. Lawsikia Hodges stated that the Public Service Grant Council may want to look at the application scoring sheet and evaluate the point system again. She stated that there is 90 points given for mandatory criteria and she felt points were no needed for this section. If the mandatory requirements are not met at the time of application, they should not be considered. Nancy Kirts stated that this would not impact the overall score because the overall application score was based on points with an associated percentage. Last year, the minimum threshold for grant consideration was an application with a score of 70%. It would be left up to the Public Service Grant Council to raise the bar to make it a higher percentage Section IV, Program Performance has only 18 points. Arnold Tritt stated that he did want to waste his time looking at an application that had not met the requirements. Lawsikia Hodges explained to Arnold Tritt that by Chapter 118.202 (e) (i), the Public Service Grant Council is tasked with reviewing and evaluating the applications. Nancy Kirts suggested considering each organization individually. Last year, the Public Service Grant Council treated everyone together in terms of how they funded-each individual organization application and reviewed it on its own merit and then the impact of what that organization was trying to achieve could be evaluated. Decisions would be based on the impact to Jacksonville. Lawsikia Hodges also stated that the Public Service Grant Council look at the scoring and point values of Program Needs.

- **Presentations**

Ronald Mallett asked if Oral Presentations should have any weight or point value. Edgar Mathis stated no. It makes the organization feel good that they have had their day in court, but it shouldn't sway funding decisions. John Donahoo stated that it provided an opportunity to ask questions of those organizations that he didn't get a chance to visit. He thinks the idea of having to put a face with an organization and make that connection works well. He felt that the Oral Presentation should have some weight value. Edgar Mathis stated that he would like to have the benefit to have the staff monitoring reports available to him when making site visits. Edgar Mathis stated that he would like to see some sort of evaluation from staff for FY 2011 so he can make a good a good decision based on factual information. Ronald Mallett stated he wanted to get a vote on whether the Public Service Grant Council site visits should receive a grade. Arnold Tritt

stated no, he puts more weight on the unscheduled site visit than a planned visit. Ronald Mallett stated that if he doesn't make that site visit he can hear about that organization from the staff site monitoring reports. John Donahoo stated yes to site visits, he finds them beneficial. Ronald Mallett stated he wanted to go across the table to see who would like a pass/fail system for the site visits. John Donahoo stated yes, Arnold Tritt stated yes, Ronald Mallett stated yes and Edgar Mathis stated yes. John Donahoo asked the audience how did they feel about the site visits and the majority liked the pass/fail system also. Lawsikia Hodges asked that everyone look at "Section 4 - Program Performance" of application grading score sheet where it states that they only receive 18 points. She suggested changing the point value up to 50. Ronald Mallett stated that the scoring process should be based on the immediate need of the community. Edgar Mathis asked that the points be removed from the mandatory sections because it is not needed. Ronald Mallett stated that he would like to see more weight in "Section 5 - Program Operating Capacity". Edgar Mathis stated that the way the staff formatted the grading matrix spreadsheet to include Unit Cost, Number of People Served, etc. helped him with his evaluation. Lawsikia Hodges stated that the Public Service Grant Council may want to look at the part 6 of Chapter 118 which deals with the Cultural Council categories of Community Impact and Need for the organization. Lawsikia Hodges also stated that what she thinks Ronald Mallett is trying to do is condense the number of grading categories down to 5 and allocate the 100 points. She feels that this would justify the quality of the program and performance. Nancy Kirts stated that the staff will work on this. Edgar Mathis asked the audience how many of them implement customer satisfaction surveys. The majority stated they did conduct these surveys and knew their rating.

Wrap-up

Ronald Mallett did an overview of the topics discussed:

- (1) All four agreed on site visits being a pass-fail
- (2) The community needs section of the grant application should be weighted **(voted 3 -1)**
- (3) Program Effectiveness should be weighted for the quality of the program **(voted 2 - 2)**
The budget and any of the sub-categories will be added under Program Effectiveness that are on the current list.

Adjourned:

Time: 12:15 p.m.

Minutes Prepared by: Linda Platte'