



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes - Final

Human Services Commission

Tuesday, February 16, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

Department of Public
Health and Human
Services
Conference Room 1
1005 W. Worley

I. CALL TO ORDER

Camp called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

Present: 6 - Amy Camp, Nathan First, Stacy Ford, Sharon Schattgen, Diane Suhler and Justin Thomas

Absent: 2 - Tonia Compton and Mark Jones

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Ford moved to approve the agenda. First seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 17, 2015 MEETING MINUTES

Suhler moved to approve the minutes. Ford seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed. Introductions were made.

IV. ELECTION OF OFFICERS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVE

Camp asked Hollis to list the officers required. Hollis stated the commission required a Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary. Hollis stated the previous Vice-Chair and Secretary did not reapply for the commission which left those two positions vacant. Camp stated she would be giving someone else the opportunity to fill the Chair position. Camp asked for nominations. Hollis stated the easiest way to proceed would be to put forward a slate. Hollis reminded the commission that the Community Development Liaison was a voting member of the Community Development Commission and would be another position that was required to be filled. Hollis stated the Community Development Commission makes recommendations to council for the Community Development Block Grant and HOME funding which is used to address affordable housing, community facilities, and economic development and vocational training. Hollis stated this joint position is intended to assist with the coordination of efforts. Camp asked for nominations. Camp suggested the CDC position continue to be filled by Jones. First suggested that those commissioners who have been on the commission for the longest be the ones to fill the officer positions. Thomas nominated Ford for Chair. Ford accepted the nomination. Hollis stated that the Chair works with staff

to develop the meeting agendas and the annual presentation to the council. Suhler nominated Thomas for Vice-Chair. Thomas accepted the nomination. Camp nominated First for Secretary. First accepted the nomination. Suhler moved to approve the slate of Ford as Chair, Thomas as Vice-Chair, First as Secretary and Jones as Community Development Liaison. Schattgen seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Review of FY2016 Social Services Funding Allocation Process

Hollis asked if there were any issues regarding the allocation process or site visits. There were none.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2016 Human Services Commission Meeting Calendar

Hollis asked if there were any issues regarding the draft commission meeting calendar. There were none. Hollis stated funding dates would be handled separately in the RFP.

B. City Social Services Funding Policy

Hollis stated the current policy was sent to the commission prior to the meeting. Hollis stated there was a lot of work done on the policy and process over the past few years so he didn't have any recommended changes at this time. Hollis suggested that next year the definition of youth be changed from 18 and under to 19 and under to be consistent with the county's definition. Hollis stated this would help with the collective impact approach to local funding. Hollis reminded the commission that this was an issue with Youth Empowerment Zone in the last RFP. Hollis stated he recommends the change be made next year as the issue does not tend to affect basic needs providers, which is the focus of the upcoming RFP, and because there are several providers just entering the second year of children, youth, and family contracts. So, Hollis stated he feels making the change next year, in advance of the children, youth, and family RFP, would be the way to go. Hollis asked if the commissioners had any other changes to suggest. Camp agreed that there was confusion with the population ages. Thomas stated the definition of youth on the bottom of page 5 of the policy would benefit from clarification. Hollis clarified that Thomas was referring to the idea that if someone was proposing a basic needs service but it was for children and youth, they must apply under the Children, Youth and Family RFP. Hollis stated this was a commission decision as the commission wanted to consider the whole child and approach this area as a population rather than an issue. Hollis stated the footnote on the policy states that even if the proposed services were applicable to another issue area, for example mental health counseling services would typically be considered within the behavioral health issue area, if mental health counseling services are proposed to be targeted specifically to children and youth this program service proposal would be considered under the Children, Youth and Family RFP. Thomas asked about the issue with Youth Empowerment Zone. Hollis stated he felt the issue with Youth Empowerment Zone's last proposal was unrelated. He said YEZ knew they were applying for services for adults age 19 and older based on the RFP requirements and

discussions during the Letter of Intent process, but it seems that they simply submitted the same information from their county proposal for youth services in their city proposal for adults. Hollis stated an example of how this applies to other providers is that the Salvation Army and True North both serve children, but the primary recipients of their services are adults so they each apply under the Basic Needs and Emergency Services RFP. Thomas asked if the difference was primary versus exclusive service. Hollis agreed this was the difference. Hollis clarified this discussion referred to the footnote on pages 5 and 6 of the Funding Cycle section of the policy. Camp asked if the change in the definition of youth would be discussed next cycle or next year. Hollis clarified this would be addressed next year as part of the policy discussion and then that change would be incorporated in the children, youth, and family RFP.

C. FY2017 Social Services Funding Allocation Process

Hollis asked if there was any additional feedback regarding the process which should be considered as the next RFP is being developed. Hollis stated that he is recommending the City end its practice of conducting evaluations of the capacity of applicant provider organizations. Hollis stated the evaluation process is expensive and labor intensive. Hollis stated the Truman school agreed that this project was very labor intensive and was a stretch to accomplish given the resources available. Hollis stated in the last RFP there was pushback from a provider who completed the process but was not approved for funding. Hollis stated that as a government entity, it is difficult for the city to justify capacity building only for a limited number of non-profits. Hollis stated he would prefer that voluntary capacity evaluation and building be provided by a private entity like the United Way. Hollis stated the United Way was currently submitting a grant application in order to provide this service. Hollis stated this would free city and county resources to address issue analysis. Hollis stated that the city, county and United Way are interested in combining resources to build a web based platform for community issues, indicators, and goals. Hollis stated the city does not currently have any dedicated data resources, and there is a constant need for data. Hollis stated he was not sure how much the capacity information factored into the commission's funding allocation recommendations. Hollis said he thought the process did provide a benefit to the provider organizations, which is why he is recommending a voluntary process administered by the United Way. Hollis stated one issue with the current evaluation process is that much of the information is self-reported by the providers due to the financial constraints of the process. He said this has resulted in a very small provider having the same score as a large provider which clearly has more capacity. Ford agreed the capacity evaluation was not used to allocate funds and the proposals and site visits had the most influence on funding allocation. Ford stated resources were needed to identify issues. Camp stated the evaluation was a help to agencies. Hollis stated the evaluations cost \$500 per provider which is a good value but still a strain on limited resources. Schattgen asked for clarification on the process. Schattgen stated it was her understanding the University was paid to complete the study to determine capacity but the data was not useful to the commission in order to allocate funds. Hollis stated he agreed with this summary of the situation. Hollis stated the evaluation process would make more sense if there were, for example, ten agencies providing the same service. But, given the variety of providers and proposed services even within one RFP, it winds up being an apples to oranges comparison. Hollis stated this process has evolved from the City providing direct capacity building around performance measurement to the current process of an objective evaluation of the capacity of applicant providers.

Schattgen asked if this could be done without paying the University. Hollis stated it could be to some degree by incorporating key items into the Organization Profile. Hollis asked the commission consider the capacity evaluation and provide feedback at the next meeting.

Hollis stated the city assisted with building the United Way's new RFP process in AFF and that this same process will be utilized by the City and County going forward. Hollis said the changes will not be evident to the commissioners or other end users but would greatly improve the process flow from an administrative standpoint. Hollis stated they are still working to develop an additional form in which final proposal information will be included in order to develop contracts and reports. Hollis stated another improvement he would like to make is to include the staff/commission comments in the system rather than using separate documents. First asked if there would still be five separate forms. Hollis stated this is a technical issue because there are so many fields they cannot all be included in one form. Hollis stated there were benefits to the having multiple forms such as the ability to work on separate forms at the same time. Camp stated this process should be easier next time.

Camp asked if anyone had any further issues to discuss. Hollis asked for commissioners to provide any proposed process changes as soon as possible.

VII. STAFF REPORT

Camp asked for any further staff report. Hollis stated there was an issue with the provider board member term dates being provided in inconsistent formats in the Organization Profile which was addressed by adding date fields to the form. Hollis stated the FTE fields in the Top Five Compensated Employee were better clarified in the instructions.

Hollis asked that the commission consider his recommendation regarding the evaluation process and be prepared to finalize a decision at the March meeting. In the meantime, he will review the process and determine any key items that might be added to the Organization Profile.

Hollis stated that the City, County and United Way have a three year plan to build common taxonomy of services, community issues/indicators, and individual outcomes is intended to help tell a cohesive story about the collective impact we are making. Hollis stated most of the problems encountered in the proposals would be addressed by having these three resources. Hollis stated this is a very ambitious plan given the complexity of each item and that no additional resources are available. Also, Hollis said they still need to finalize the revisions to the AFF system and are doing so as part of a team which takes longer. So, Hollis said it is very possible achieving all of the objectives in the plan may take longer than three years. First agreed this may be more work than expected.

First asked how common the use of taxonomy with unit pricing included was with other municipalities. Hollis stated it was not very common. He said the St Louis County Children's Services Fund was the closest example they have found. First stated he would like to see precedence to evaluate if this would work. Hollis said they would be exploring other funders' models and would provide that information to the commission.

Hollis stated Suhler and one of her students were assisting with him to compile indicators for the City's strategic plan, for which he was very appreciative.

Hollis said that the issue analysis will again not be available for the upcoming RFP. Hollis stated he would pull together as many indicators as possible to share with the commission at the April meeting.

VIII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

No comments.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Comments.

X. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

No comments.

XI. FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Hollis reminded the commission that any policy changes and the decisions about the provider capacity evaluation need to be finalized at the next meeting. Hollis stated the indicators should be available in April.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 pm.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.