

Public Service Grant Council Subcommittee on Funding Methodologies Meeting Minutes

Date: April 7, 2009

Time: 2:30 pm

Present: Ronald Mallett, John Donahoo and Arnold Tritt

Welcome: Ronald Mallett welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions.

FY 2010 Application Grading Criteria

Scoring Instructions overview

John Snyder explained the roles of the Public Service Grant monitors in the scoring process. Monitors grade each application and assign a total score based on a possible 252 points and a percentage score is then calculated using a formula. Mr. Snyder stated that 10 points is allocated for turning in the mandatory cover letter with the required information. Mr. Mallett asked if this was just an ordinary cover letter. Mr. Snyder explained that there are certain criteria required in the cover letter that must be answered taken directly from Chapter 118. Mr. Mallett asked if the cover letter was what they were trying to eliminate with the proposed Ordinance changes and Mr. Snyder responded, yes. Mr. Snyder stated that the Proposal Narrative was allocated 10 points for grading purposes and confirmed that the questions to be answered were required in Chapter 118. Other points assigned were as follows: the Overall Application presentation - 8 points for following the application instructions; the Agency Cover Sheet - 4 points; the Agency Overview - 12 points that includes the Agency Narrative, Agency leadership and licensures, Certificates and accreditations; the Program Overview - 40 points which is composed of the Executive Summary, Priority population, service delivery, hours of operation, program fees, description of staff who will carry out the program, satisfaction survey or not, community involvement and utilization of volunteers; the Program Performance covering objectives - 18 points; Program Operating Capacity - 12 points; Program participant service level - 4 points; Program Accessibility - 4 points; Interagency Efforts - 8 points; Budget - 32 points. Mr. Mallett stated that he noticed inconsistency with the signing of the FY 2010 applications by either being a board member or the Executive Director. Mr. Snyder explained that as long as the name and addresses of all Board members is provided (sometimes provided as an attachment) an extra 2 points would be allocated. Arnold Tritt asked Mr. Snyder if there was anything that he learned from the Cultural Council's funding allocation process. John Donahoo stated that if that process was implemented, it would work well. He felt that it might be helpful to have a joint meeting or a presentation from the Cultural Council similar to what was done with the Safety Net presentation from the Non-Profit panel discussion at the 2/17/09 PSG Council meeting. Mr. Tritt asked the audience if they had ever received a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). He went on to ask the audience if the CDBG funding process was simpler than how Public Service Grants are funded. Mr. Tritt stated the reason for the question was because he would like the PSG funding process to be more staff driven. Staff could determine the criteria and the points and if an application does

not receive a score of 70, he did not want it to be considered by the PSG Council. Mr. Snyder stated that each PSG Council sub-committee members had been provided with a spreadsheet showing the Cultural Council's funding process. He stated that points are given for their objectives and how viable they are. All FY 2010 applications should be graded before the 4/21/09 PSG Council meeting. Mr. Mallett asked if any of the FY 2010 applications had been disqualified. Mr. Snyder stated that there were (3) FY 2010 applications that did not meet the mandatory requirements. Mr. Mallett asked if those (3) applications were in the books that the PSG Council received and John stated yes.

Mr. Snyder explained that he had spoken with both Cultural Council and United Way about their grading process in order to come up with the spreadsheet presented with the detailed items. The same spreadsheet was used to fund the Jacksonville Journey program recipients earlier this fiscal year. Mr. Donahoo asked John if the PSG Council should weight Priority Populations as a basis for funding such as food, shelter and housing rather than funding programs that aren't a high priority at this time due to the economy. Mr. Tritt said that the PSG Council has the authority to do just that by funding the priority populations that have been impacted the greatest. Ronald Mallett stated that an option could be to prioritize the applications by Level I, Level II and Level III based on the Priority Population.

Meeting adjourned: 3:50pm

Minutes Prepared by: Linda Platte'