HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION

The special meeting of the City of Loveland Human Services Commission was held at the Loveland Municipal Building in the City Council Chambers on
October 3, 2013

<u>PRESENT AT THE MEETING</u>:

Commissioners: Penn Street, Lorna Greene, Stan Taylor, Tim Hitchcock, Amy Olinger, Alex McKenna, Marcy Yoder, and Melody Bettenhausen
Staff Liaison: Alison Hade

<u>ABSENT FROM THE MEETING</u>:
Commissioners: Ally Miller, Rebecca Paulson, Audra Montoya, and April Lewis

These minutes are a general summary of the meeting.

<u>CALL TO ORDER</u>
Chair Street called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

<u>APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES</u>
Commissioner Hitchcock motioned to approve the minutes of the September 26th meeting.
Commissioner Greene seconded the motion and passing with a unanimous vote.

<u>PUBLIC COMMENTS</u>
None

<u>CITY COUNCIL LIAISON UPDATE</u>
None

<u>CHANGES TO THE GRANT GUIDE</u>
See attached.
<u>Grant Proposal</u>:
Q4- What is the agency's objective for this program?
Commissioners discussed if they wanted to change the question, but felt it was clear enough. Measurements are different depending on the program, some may want an increase while others may want a decrease and some may just be maintaining. Comments were made such as, It is weighted heavily to encourage as much information as possible. A motion was made, to leave question 4 as is, by Commissioner Hitchcock and seconded by Commissioner Taylor, passing with 6 ayes and 1 nay.
Q15-17- (15) How does the program utilize volunteers? What specific services do they provide? If the program does not utilize volunteers, please explain why. (16) How many people volunteer for the Loveland program annually? (17) What is the total number of volunteer hours annually for the Loveland program?
Commissioners discussed the intent of the question. Why an agency would not use volunteers? Some agencies use hundreds while others use very few. Commissioners agreed to address this at the agency grant meeting and tell them to be very clear in explaining why or why they don't use volunteers. Some commissioners felt it was important to know both the number of volunteers and the total number of volunteer hours. The score is weighted very low and getting an average score is not penalizing agencies. A motion was made by Commissioner Greene, to leave questions 15-16 as is

and take out question 17 and seconded by Commission Bettenhausen, after further discussion the motion failed with 4 nays and 3 ayes.

Commissioner Taylor made a motion to leave question 15 as is and combine questions 16 and 17 and seconded by Commissioner Hitchcock. Discussion to remove of 16 and 17 and keep question 15 ensued. The motion failed with 5 nays and 2 ayes.

Commissioner Greene made a motion to keep question 15 as is and remove questions 16 and 17, seconded by Commissioner McKenna. Discussion ensued with a couple commissioners commenting that they wanted to know the number of volunteers and total volunteer hours, but concern was also mentioned over setting agencies up to give false information. The motion passed with 5 ayes and 2 nays.

Commissioner Greene motioned to add "Loveland" to the question: How does the Loveland program utilize volunteers? The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bettenhausen and passed unanimously.

Model Partnership Award:

Q4- Describe how this is a partnership. How does this partnership maximize efficiency of administration and/or delivery of services?

Commissioner Greene made a motion to change the question to: How is this partnership more efficient in terms of time, effort, cost, and delivery of services? The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hitchcock. Discussion ensued regarding the phrasing of the question. The motion passed with 5 ayes and 2 nays.

Model Partnership Award purpose- Commissioners discussed the purpose stated in the grant guide:

Purpose:

*The City of Loveland Human Services Commission offers a one-time grant amount **of up to $10,000** to non-profit agencies that exemplify ideal partnerships in the Loveland community. The Model Partnership Award was established to encourage and/or reward efforts of collaboration on reducing duplication of services, administrative costs and increasing efficiency. The commission <u>may</u> make up to $10,000 available during the 2013 grant process to spotlight programs working together to better serve the community. Funds **may or may not** be awarded to one lead agency and divided among two or more partnering agencies, depending on quality of proposals and merit of partnerships.*

Commissioner Hitchcock made a motion to not change the purpose, which was seconded by Commissioner Greene and passing unanimously.

Other Comments:

Commissioner Greene made a motion to not include a statement emphasizing of quality of the grant proposals and presentations, which was seconded by Commissioner Bettenhausen and passing unanimously.

Pre-application Checklist: After discussion of proposed changes, a motion to approve the changes was made by Commissioner Greene, seconded by Commissioner Olinger and passing unanimously.

Additional Proposal Changes:

Q2- How does the program or project meet the Human Services Grant Program Goal?

Commissioner Taylor made a motion to not score question 2, seconded by Commissioner Hitchcock. Discussion ensued regarding whether or not the question was needed. Commissioner Taylor changed his motion to eliminate question 2 which was seconded by Commissioner Olinger and passing unanimously.

ZoomGrants: CPO staff has been looking into other ways to store large files online so the commission may be able to read proposals electronically. File Genius is a well-known site for being able to upload and store large files. The idea would be to have agencies fill out a pdf version of the proposal, send it and all the attachments via email to staff and staff will upload the files to File Genius. Each commissioner will have a password to log on to File Genius and read the proposals and attachments. The proposals will still have a deadline and the email will have a time stamp for when

they submit to the CPO. Commissioner Hitchcock made a motion to change to File Genius for the upcoming grant cycle instead of using ZoomGrants. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Greene and passed unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS
Chair Street asked the commission is they would like a presentation on the Affordable Care Act and the impact it could have on agencies and their clients. Consensus was to have Maureen O'Hare with Women's Resource Center to attend the November meeting and present.
Board members of ATV have approached some of the City Councilors regarding their plans for the Safehouse, so they may present at the November meeting as well.
Commissioner Taylor made a motion asking commissioners to raise their hands while vocally stating their response to a vote. Commissioner Bettenhausen seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT
Chair Street adjourned the meeting at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Beverly Walker

2014-2015 Grant Guide Changes

Issues	Change/Revision/Addition	Agree/ Disagree	Action	Motion/Passing	Motion/ Failing
Eligibility					
Pre App	Do we need one?	**Yes**	Checklist.	Motion Commissioner Greene to keep pre-app. Seconded by C. Miller passing with 7 ayes, 2 nays	Motion C. Greene to change format to an LOI. 2nd by C. Miller failing with 6 nays, 3 ayes
Change the pre-application questions to pass the eligibility test.	What target population do you serve? (Check all that apply) Persons with Disabilities_____ Low Income(51% AMI or below)_____ Seniors_____ Children_____ Domestic Violence Victims_____ Homeless_____ etc.	**Yes**	CPO will create a checklist.	Motion C. Greene to develop a checklist. 2nd by C. Taylor passing unanimously.	
Pre App, Q7 on App	Does the pre-app list of populations served eliminate Q7 on the application?	**Yes**	Remove Q7	Motion C. Greene to eliminate Q7 2nd by Vice Chair Paulson passing unanimously.	
Application	Move pre-app Q5, 6, 7 to application.	**Yes**		Motion C. Miller to move Pre-app Q5,6,7 to app. 2nd by C. Hitchcock passing unanimously.	

Application	Merge Q7 with app Q1.	**Yes**		Motion C. Taylor to merge Q7 & Q1 in app. 2nd by C. Miller passing unanimously.	
Eligibility	Should the description of types of projects funded be spelled out more clearly? Should it just be the check boxes or should the description be strengthened?	**No vote needed.**	Part of checklist.		
Eligibility	The CPO will likely need to keep Q2&3 in some form (application?) to meet HUD guidelines. Will look for regulation and update.	**No vote needed.**	Part of checklist.		

<u>Attachments</u>	

Not using ZoomGrants would change this issue for agencies with multiple applications	Depending on the program we use, we wouldn't want more than one 990, Roster, P&L, and Agency Budget	**Yes**	Staff will receive an email with everything, so we will have it or we won't.	Motion by C. Taylor to change to File Genius. 2nd by C. Greene passing unanimously.	

<u>Budget</u>	

Agencies are confused about what the Program Budget is for: the program in Loveland or the low income clients in Loveland.	How did you derive the information used for this budget? (What are your sources?) or How did you arrive at the dollar amounts used in this budget? (What are your sources?)	**Yes**	How did you derive the information used for this budget? (What are your sources?) No Comm. Score for one grant cycle.	Motion by C. Greene to add to Q24 on the application 2nd by C. Miller passing unanimously.	

Propose New or Change Application Question					
Additional Question? Would it be scored?	Is it possible to track permanent outcomes from your program? i.e. clients 'graduating' to no longer requiring assistance from human service organizations.	**No**		Motion by C. Paulson to not include this question in the grant application. 2nd by C. Greene passing unanimously.	
Additional Question? Would it be scored?	Would funding for this program create new hire opportunities/increase employment?	**No**		Motion by C. Greene not to add this question. 2nd by C. Taylor passing unanimously.	
Change to question 1, Additional Question or an eligibility question?	What would you say is your agency's PRIMARY category of service? From a list of services; perhaps Disabled, Education, Family, Food, Health/Physical, Health/Mental, Homeless, Housing, Multi-Faceted (more than three of the above, Seniors, Youth, Other	**No vote needed.**	Part of checklist		
Q4	An agency rep asked if it is okay for written objectives to be written without indicating an increase.	N/A		Motion by C. Hitchcock to leave Q. 4 as is. 2nd by C. Taylor passing with 6 ayes and 1 nay.	
Q15-17	An agency rep commented that she thought that the use of volunteers would not be scored. Should this be changed or just better explained to agencies how to provide information? Some agencies called to ask if this includes board hours.	see the minutes of the 10-3-13 meeting		Motion by C. Greene to keep Q15 and remove 16 & 17. 2nd by C. McKenna passing 5-2.	

MPA

Change question 4?	Do we want to ask 'How would this partnership make the project more efficient?' OR 'How is this .... more efficient in terms of time, effort, cost?'	**Yes**	Change question	Motion by C. Greene to change the question to How is your partnership more efficient in terms of time, effort, cost and delivery of services? 2nd by C. Hitchcock passing 5 -2.	
Model Partnership Award purpose:	Could successful MPA's be meant to be 'seed money' to jump start new projects, or are they meant to 'reward' collaborations for good work already happening?	**No**	No Change	Motion by C. Hitchcock not to change the purpose. 2nd by C. Greene passing unanimously.	

Other comments

Quality control:	Do we need to emphasize/express that for scoring purposes agencies need to be aware of the weight/value/quality of the grant proposal and grant presentation?	**No**	No Change	Motion by C. Greene to not include a statement re: quality. 2nd by C. Bettenhausen passing unanimously.	