



General Government & Social Services

March 1st, 2016

Summary and Motions

Chair Lamb called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Committee Members Lamb, Evans, J. Brown, Bledsoe, F. Brown, Moloney and Scutchfield were in attendance. Committee Members Akers, Gibbs and Henson were absent. Vice Mayor Kay was also in attendance as a non-voting member.

I. Approval of Committee Summary

A motion was made by Scutchfield to approve the February 2, 2016 General Government & Social Services Committee Summary, seconded by Evans. The motion passed without dissent.

II. Extended Social Resource (ESR) Process

Bledsoe introduced the Extended Social Resource (ESR) presentation. Commissioner Ford presented proposed ESR policy revisions and considerations for the FY2017. Potential policy revisions include reestablishment of an annual grant cycle, redefining funding priorities, establishing funding limits, and revising the evaluation and ranking process.

Bledsoe stated her appreciation for the new categories that allow for an "apples-to-apples" comparison of applications during the scoring process and stated she would like to see a range of funding percentages to allow for flexibility. Bledsoe noted that a requirement for a single application would be helpful, but feels it may be challenging for some agencies. In response to a question from Bledsoe, Ford stated that removal of the innovation & collaboration scoring component is being considered. Bledsoe noted she would like the department to consider awards for one-year pilot programs that do not fit within the two-year funding cycle.

Moloney stated his appreciation for the two-year funding cycle and the benefit it has for Social Services staff. Moloney stated that this is the best he has ever seen the program.

Evans expressed concern regarding the collaboration score and inquired if it is necessary to redefine the award categories at this time. Ford responded that redefining the categories is helpful from a scoring standpoint.

Kay stated the process is the most fair and transparent it has been, and noted that award limits should not be implemented, as funding should be available for the highest quality programs. Kay noted that requiring a single application could be limiting to some agencies, and inquired if innovation is still an appropriate scoring criterion. Ford replied that scoring should reward efficiency.

J. Brown stated his appreciation for the changes to the ranking process and echoed remarks

that a single-application policy may be limiting. In response to J. Brown, Ford stated that Social Services staff follows up with all agencies to evaluate outcomes, and that the agencies submit quarterly reports.

In response to Lamb, Ford stated the department confirms funding categories for each application.

Charlie Lanter provided an overview of Homelessness Prevention program funding, and stated that program quarterly reports are reviewed to ensure consistent outcomes.

Lamb inquired what measuring tools are used to evaluate quarterly reports. Theresa Maynard responded that the approved PSA for each agency includes an addendum that establishes measurable outcomes, and the quarterly reports must show progress towards those outcomes.

Kay stated that it would be useful to apply the proposed process amendments to previous application cycles to examine the impacts of the changes.

Bledsoe stated that most applications affecting seniors will fall within the new categories and does not feel that the new categories mean that seniors will be underserved.

Lamb stated that the Committee will need to approve a new version of the resolution which will come back to Committee at a later date. Ford stated that, if there are no changes to the application cycle, the Department is in a position to move forward with the next two-year grant cycle.

Evans inquired if the potential policy revisions and considerations are the Department's suggestions, and Ford replied that they are areas for the Committee's consideration.

Scutchfield noted that the Department of Social Services is not endorsing changes at this stage, which Ford confirmed. Scutchfield stated there is no need for a motion at this time, and that the item will be before the Committee again.

Kay requested clarification of the motion.

In response to Evans, Ford stated the first four recommendations are for the Committee to consider.

J. Brown inquired if a hybrid process can be created between the one and two year cycle. Ford stated that the application cycle could be amended as necessary to respond to community need. J. Brown noted his agreement to revise the evaluation and ranking process.

Bledsoe stated her desire to see more clarification in the categories and to explore a hybrid cycle. She offered to work with Social Services on a draft resolution.

Lamb stated that this item will be brought back to the Committee for additional consideration.

A motion was made by Moloney to accept the policy revisions as presented, seconded by Evans. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Scutchfield to amend the motion to keep the ESR process in Committee and have a Resolution establishing policy revisions come back to Committee for further consideration, seconded by Bledsoe. The motion passed without dissent.

III. Items in Committee

A motion was made by Scutchfield to remove Aquatic Program Design from Committee, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by J. Brown to adjourn, seconded by Scutchfield. The motion passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

D.S. 3-2-2016