

Memorandum

Bloomington Common Council
Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee
23 February 2010
Noon
Council Library (Suite 110)
City Hall

In attendance: *Committee:* Tim Mayer, Isabel Piedmont-Smith, Andy Ruff, Susan Sandberg, Mike Satterfield and Dr. Anthony Pizzo (CDBG appointee). [*Absent:* Hans Huffman (CFR appointee)].
Staff: Lisa Abbott and Marilyn Patterson (HAND); Dan Sherman and Stacy Jane Rhoads (Council Office)

I. PROLOGUE

Sherman welcomed all present and reviewed that the point of the meeting is to review last year's process and decide what we want to keep the same and what we want to change. He pointed out that all members of the Committee are the same as last year, which helps with continuity and understanding.

II. ELECTION OF CHAIR

Mayer moved that Satterfield be appointed Chair of the 2010 Committee; Sandberg seconded the motion.

▶ *The Committee voted unanimously in favor of Satterfield's service as Chair.*

III. AUTHORIZATION OF COUNCIL OFFICE TO TAKE MEETING NOTES

Sherman requested that the Committee authorize the Council Office (in lieu of the City Clerk) to act as secretary to the Committee.

▶ *The Committee agreed to authorize the Council Office to act as secretary.*

IV. FUNDS AVAILABLE

Sherman reminded the Committee that it has \$200,000 in funds to allocate this year – a \$20,000 increase over funds available last year. Sherman offered a brief historical sketch of the Committee and indicated that next year the Committee will have allocated over two million dollars in social services funds since its founding in 1993. Since its inception, the Committee has allocated over \$1.9 million in social services funds. Over time, the Committee's distributions look like this:

1993	\$90,000	2006	\$135,000
1994-1995	\$40,000	2007	\$145,000
1996	\$50,000	2008	\$165,000
1997-1998	\$90,000	2009	\$180,000
1999-2001	\$100,000	2010	\$200,000
2002-2004	\$110,000		
2005	\$125,000		

Sherman reminded the group that the fund's history is documented on the Committee's homepage: <http://bloomington.in.gov/jack-hopkins-social-services-funding-committee>

V. HAND'S REVIEW OF THE 2009 PROGRAM

A. REPORT

Marilyn Patterson, Program Manager in the City's Housing and Neighborhood Development Department, presented her report on the 2009 Jack Hopkins grantees and their projects. The report is included in the Committee's packet and is available on the Committee's website.

Patterson reported that all grantees successfully implemented the programs for which JHSSF funds were granted. Five agencies requested extensions beyond the "expenditure of funds" deadline spelled out in the funding agreement. Patterson said that such requests for extensions are usual and to be expected. Two of these five agencies have not yet drawn down all of their funds. \$7, 014.36 is left to be spent by these agencies. Patterson said she fully expects these agencies to draw down these funds by the 19 March 2010 deadline.

- Satterfield stated that he understood that these funds were needed and that the idea was for agencies to use the money right away. Why did agencies need extensions?
Patterson pointed to three examples. First, when the Boys and Girls' Club closed for renovation, it did not need to pull down all of its CDBG money. When it re-opened, it had to use all of its CDBG money before it could use its Jack Hopkins money. In the case of the Citizen's Advocacy of South-Central Indiana, its director left and the agency did not pay anyone as it searched for a new part-time director. In the case of Middle Way House, until the emergency shelter opened, it did not have a place to store the beds and mattresses for which it received funds. It ultimately worked out a deal with a vendor to store the items.
- Abbott pointed out that the Controller prefers that money be expended from funds by end of fiscal year, where possible.
- ▶ *The Committee approved Patterson's Report.*

B. MONITORING ROLE

Mayer asked how much time Patterson spends monitoring the grants. Patterson estimates that she spends at least two hours/week monitoring the grants. Abbott suggested that the figure might be higher as Patterson tends to spend substantial time trying to get agencies to comply with the individual deadlines spelled out in the funding agreements. In the future, it might be worthwhile to think about having just one deadline for all agencies, beyond which they may seek an extension, if needed.

VI. REVIEW OF CRITERIA

The Committee reviewed its criteria. The JHSSF Committee grants funds based on the satisfaction of three criteria. At minimum, any proposal must satisfy the following to be considered for funding:

1. **Address a previously-identified priority for social services funding** (as indicated in the *Service Community Assessment of Needs (SCAN)*, City of Bloomington, Housing and Neighborhood Development Department's *2005-2010 Consolidated Plan* or any other community-wide survey of social service needs). Such priorities include funds for emergency services (food, shelter or healthcare) or other services to City residents who are: low-moderate income, under 18-years old, elderly, affected with a disability or are otherwise disadvantaged; and

2. **Ask for JHSSF funds as a one-time investment in a social service initiative**
This restriction is intended to encourage innovative projects and to allow the funds to address changing community circumstances, but allows the Committee to provide start-up and bridge funds; *and*

Leverage matching funds or other fiscal mechanisms (e.g., in-kind contributions, collaborative partnerships, etc.) to maximize JHSSF dollars; and

3. **Make a broad and long-lasting contribution to our community**
As co-founder of the JHSSF program, Jack Hopkins put it: “[P]riority should be given to projects or programs where investments now will have a positive, long-term spillover effect (such as reduced susceptibility to...diseases, decreased absences from school, reducing lost time from work, [alleviating the effects of poverty]...etc.). Historically, this criterion has excluded funding events or celebrations.

► The Committee agreed to keep the criteria the same.

VII. CHANGES FOR 2010

- New Consolidated Plan. As HAND is currently working on a new Consolidated Plan, Abbott pointed out that agencies should be able to point to SCAN, the 2005-2010 or the 2010-2015 Consolidated Plan to demonstrate that their program meets a community need.
- Eliminate Emergency Services Prioritization. Last year, the Committee added the following language to its solicitation letter highlighting emergency services:

Each year, the JHSSF program allocates funds based on four distinct criteria. *However, please note that as this year presents marked economic challenges for City residents, the Committee will be favoring applications which provide emergency services (e.g., food, shelter and medical care) to citizens in need.*

- Sherman said that this language likely discouraged some agencies from applying. Last year, the Committee received substantially fewer applications than it had in the past. That led to a number of applications being funded which would not have been funded in previous years.

- Patterson suggested eliminating this language in the interest of casting a broader net and capturing as many high-quality applications as possible.

- Mayer stated that the Committee should really encourage agency collaboration.

- Sandberg suggested the Committee also encourage innovation. She suggested that language be added to the solicitation letter to make it clear that the Committee encourages innovative and collaborative projects.

▶ *The Committee agreed to remove the language stating that the Committee will be favoring applications that provide emergency services and will instead add language that the Committee encourages innovative and collaborative projects.*

- Schools. Abbott advised the Committee that the schools will likely ask for funding this year. In the past, the Committee has said that it will not consider funding tax-based entities. Abbott encouraged the Committee to re-think this approach. Perhaps it could allow schools to apply through the MCCSC Foundation.

▶ *All agreed that as this is an extraordinary year for the schools due to a loss in State funding, the Committee will allow the school Foundation to apply as it is a non-profit.*

- Program Budget. Sherman pointed out that at last year's de-briefing meeting, Piedmont-Smith suggested that, in lieu of a year-end financial statement, providing both fund balances and total revenue & expenditures, agencies might instead provide a list of their top five sources of revenue and top five expenses. Patterson and Abbott said the "top five" requirement would be confusing to agencies and create more work for them. The financial statement is a document that most every agency has and can be easily provided.

- Sandberg advised that the Committee does not want to make more work for agencies.

- Piedmont-Smith stated that perhaps the Committee should just keep its requirement for fund balances and total revenue & expenditures the same.

- Piedmont-Smith added that the Committee should require agencies to provide information on how many full-time employees, part-time employees and volunteers it has.

▶ *The Committee agreed to add a question about the number of agency full- and part-time employees and volunteers to the application material.*

- Site Visits. Abbott suggested that the Committee can always set up a site visit if want to know more about agencies.

- Sherman cautioned that, in the past, site visits have been perceived by some to indicate favoritism.

▶ *The Committee agreed to consider site visits on an as-needed basis.*

VIII. FUNDING PROCESS

- General Process. Sherman reviewed last year’s application/funding process: after applications are submitted to the Council Office, the Office will summarize applications and send summaries and original applications to the Committee; the Committee will then convene to make an initial review of applications; after that, the Committee hears from agencies who made the cut; shortly after the presentation, the Committee rates applications and holds a pre-allocation meeting where it sketches out preliminary recommendations; finally, and shortly thereafter, the Committee makes its formal recommendations at a Allocation Hearing.
- Ratings. Sherman reviewed that each Committee member ranks each application 0-5 and also assigns each proposal a funding amount. Last year, a few Committee members did not assign a funding amount to a few agencies. One did not assign an amount because the member was unsure how much funding s/he wanted to recommend. Another did not assign an amount because s/he did not think the agency deserved any funding. This year, if a Committee member does not recommend funding, s/he should explain *why* so the Council Office can more accurately average the recommendations.

IX. SCHEDULE

Sherman presented the Committee with the following proposed timeline:

<i>Action or Meeting</i>	<i>Action to be taken at JHSSF Meeting</i>
Council Office Solicits Applications	Monday, March 1, 2010
Council Office Holds Technical Assistance Meeting	Thursday, March 11, 2010, 4:00 p.m., Council Chambers
Agencies Submit Proposals (Deadline)	Monday, March 29, 2010 by 4:00 p.m., Council Office
Council Office Distributes Application Packet to Committee Members	(By) Wednesday, April 14, 2010
Committee Initially Discusses and Eliminates Some Applications	Thursday, April 22, 2010 at 4:00 p.m., McCloskey Room
Committee Hears Presentations	Thursday, April 29, 2010 at 5:00 p.m., Council Chambers
Committee Members Submit Rating of Applications	Wednesday, May 5, 2010 by Noon, Council Office
Committee Discusses Funding Recommendations at a Pre-Allocation Meeting	Monday, May 10, 2010, at 4:00 p.m., McCloskey Room
Committee Makes Funding Recommendations	Monday, May 17, 2010, 5:00 p.m., Chambers
Agencies Complete the Funding Agreements	Thursday, May 27, 2010, Council Office
Committee Evaluates the Program	Wednesday, June 2, 2010, 6:00 p.m., Council Library
Common Council Action on the Recommendations	Wednesday, June 16, 2010, 7:30 p.m., Council Chambers
HAND Holds Technical Assistance Meeting	Tuesday, June 22, 2010, 8:30 a.m., McCloskey Room

► *The Committee approved the proposed timeline.*

X. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 1:22 pm