City of Loveland

HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 29, 2010

The Special Allocation meeting of the City of Loveland Human Services Commission was held at the Loveland Municipal Building in the City Manager's Conference Room on
April 29, 2010

PRESENT AT THE MEETING:
Staff Liaison: Darcy McClure
Commission Members: Lorna Greene, Jackie Elliott, Kallan Christensen,
John Allison, Luis Castellanos, Keely Sudhoff,
Jennifer Bohlander, Rosanne Carroll, Kevin Boyle,
and Dell Rae Moellenberg
Council Liaison: Donna Rice
Guests: Geoff Hamilton, President of Zoom Grants
Courtney Bell, High School Student

These minutes are a general summary of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER
Chair Elliott called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 25TH MINUTES
A motion to approve the minutes was made by Vice Chair Bohlander and was seconded by Commissioner Greene, which passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
No comments.

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON UPDATE
Councilor Rice stated that she is very appreciative of all the work the commission has done.

MEMBERSHIP UPDATE
Chair Elliott notified the commission of Steven Schafer's resignation. Commissioner Schafer's resignation prior to the allocation meeting required that the commission decide whether or not to allow Commissioner Schafer's scores in the final allocation decision.
The commission reviewed three options of final scores provided by staff:
Option 1 showed scores of 10 commissioners with the staff's adjustment for corrections of mathematical errors on the budget percentages and the staff's scoring of agency timeliness.
Option 2 showed scores of all 11 commissioners with no adjustment to scores for mathematical errors or the staff's scoring of agency timeliness.
Option 3 showed scores of all 11 commissioners with the staff's adjustment for corrections of mathematical errors on the budget percentages and the staff's scoring of agency timeliness.

After discussion by the commissioners and viewing of the different score options, Commissioner Boyle motioned to exclude Steven Schafer's scores and go with option 1, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Carroll and passed unanimously.

GRANT ALLOCATIONS
Staff Liaison McClure went over the commissioner's overall scores and how the average scores are determined. The scores are put on a spreadsheet in order of ranking with variations of allocating the requested amounts in several different percentage options for the commissioners to choose from or amend to how they would like to see the moneys distributed. These options on the spreadsheet ranged from A through F.
Commissioner Greene pointed out to the commissioners these options are not set in stone and each year, allocating has been done differently. Commissioner Greene stated, one year the commission tried to fund every agency possible and one year they decided to fund enough so that they could actually accomplish something and not be funded as a "token".
Discussion ensued regarding the options and how commissioners felt about them.
Chair Elliott stated that she felt they all would like to give 100% funding to all agencies, they all are important to our community.

The commissioners started with eliminating the options they did not want to use. Motion to eliminate options A & B was made by Commissioner Greene and seconded by Commissioner Christensen, passing unanimously.
Motion to eliminate option F was made by Commissioner Greene and seconded by Vice Chair Bohlander, passing unanimously.
Motion to use option E as it stands was made by Commissioner Greene and seconded by Commissioner Castellanos, the motion was defeated.
Motion to use option C as it stands was made by Commissioner Boyle and seconded by Commissioner Moellenberg, the motion was defeated.
Discussion ensued on using the option where there is the largest break in points or using the option where the percentage breaks at the 25% lowest scoring agencies.
Motion to use the break in points, funding the agencies where the break is at 239 as the lowest point was made by Commissioner Moellenberg and seconded by Vice Chair Bohlander, the motion was tied 5 ayes and 5 nays.
Motion to eliminate option D was made by Vice Chair Bohlander and seconded by Commissioner Moellenberg, passing unanimously.
Discussion ensued on modifying option E's percentages.
Motion by Commissioner Boyle to accept the amended option E was seconded by Commissioner Greene, passing with 8 ayes and 2 nays. This option left a balance of $872.00. Motion to have the balance go to the top scoring agency was made by Commissioner Greene and seconded by Commissioner Castellanos, passing unanimously.

The Model Partnership Award's top scoring agencies in partnership are Meals on Wheels (MOW) and the Community Kitchen (CK). Motion to accept MOW/CK as the recommended recipients of the Model Partnership Award was made by Commissioner Greene and seconded by Commissioner Allison, which passed unanimously.

The HSC's recommendations for grants will be presented to the City Council on June 1st, the council meeting will begin at 6:30pm. Chair Elliott and Staff Liaison McClure will present to the council, all commissioners are welcome to attend.

1 **DISCUSSION OF MAY'S MEETING 2011 GRANT ITEMS**
2 The commissioner's discussed several items of concern and areas needing additional clarification that
3 came up throughout the 2010 grant process. See attached.

4 **ADJOURNMENT**
5 Meeting adjourned by Chair Elliott at 7:47 p.m.
6
7 Respectfully Submitted,
8 Beverly Walker

Items for HSC June Grant Discussion

- Conflicts of interest. What is the best way for commissioners to advocate for an agency or should they?

- Giving new agencies more time on their presentation or visiting a new agency prior to scoring? How to level the playing field? Would extra time be giving "special treatment"?

- Asking an agency to give more information to an individual commissioner, should be presented to all commissioners by the agency to avoid "special treatment."

- Training of scoring, reading applications, etc.

- Mock applications to score.

- Ask agencies to give presentations throughout the year.

- Funding for Loveland residents or agencies only.

- ZoomGrants, thoughts, feelings, and etc.

Model Partnership Awards

- Discuss Model Partnership Award and what the commissioners want included on the application.

- Suggestion of two Model Partnership Awards, $10,000 each.

Changes to Application

- Agencies are still not understanding the question regarding "goals," they talk about what they do, not their program goals.

- More specific wording on question #8, regarding cost per client.

- Need total number of hours for all volunteers.

- More clarification on number of volunteers, two separate questions: Number of volunteers? and How are they used?

- List who they coordinate with and how they coordinate.

- Need more clarification on outcomes.

- Question 19, Need to expand question to have agencies explain HOW they partner with other agencies.

- Need a question on how volunteers are trained and what their qualifications are.

Budget Items

- Budgets forms need the agency name on them, have agencies fill in their name at the top of the budget form.

- Clarify the grant budget, city dollars are not to be used for fundraising expenses, direct services only.

- Salaries aren't clear, agencies use an average. Ask for more detail on staffing levels and salaries, need a way to compare.

- Need more clarification from agencies when the program and the agency budgets are different, what the umbrella agency is.

Scoring

- Protocol for blank scores, scores with incorrect math, scoring for missing a presentation, etc.

- Discuss using Standard Error calculation.