Steve Hollis <steve.hollis@como.gov>

Response to Recs in June 9 HS Staff Report & Analysis of HS FY2020 Proposal Org Data

1 message

Sharon <sfschattgen@aol.com>　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Mon, Jun 8, 2020 at 4:58 PM
Reply-To: Sharon <sfschattgen@aol.com>
To: "steve.hollis@como.gov" <steve.hollis@como.gov>

Hi, Steve--

In this memo, I offer my reactions to the recommendations about FY2021 funding that you made in your 6.9.2020 Staff Report to HS Commissioners. Additionally, as per the discussion at our last HSC meeting, I am attaching my (very simple) analysis of Commissioners' ratings of the Organizational dimensions in the FY2020 proposals.

1A) Based on your thorough explanations and your sound rationales, I wholeheartedly support each of your recommendations pertaining to FY2021 funding, as presented in Staff Report--which means that I also support your recommendation about the issue areas to be addressed in the FY2021 RFP.

> Children, Youth, and Families
> ☐ Reduce the amount of funding we allocate to children, youth, and family services. We do not need to address this in the RFP. Instead, I would suggest we make allocations with a cap of $200,000 for this service area when we make allocations.
> ☐ Only accept proposals from currently contracted providers for currently contracted children, youth, and family services, with the exception of home visiting, which is a service provided by our department.
> ☐ Indicate to City Council, when the contract recommendations are made in December, that it is our recommendation that the City cease purchasing children, youth, and family services unless additional social services funding can be made available.
>
> Targeted Opportunity
> ☐ Utilize approximately $50,000 to support low-barrier, overnight emergency shelter services.
>
> Economic Opportunity
> ☐ Utilize the balance of at least $100,000 for income support and employment services.

1B) I also support your recommendation to eliminate the site visits connected to the FY2021 proposal-review process. As you know, I truly value these visits, and I always learn from them. But, given how easily Covid-19 spreads, going to sites this fall would jeopardize the health of Commissioners as well as agency personnel and clients.

1C) The FY 2021 proposal-review time line looks fine to me, given that it is much like the schedule we have followed in previous years (minus the site visits). So, Commissioners' "big ratings deadlines" are Oct 13 (come to HSC meeting with our preliminary ratings) and Oct. 21 (due date for entering final ratings into Apricot). Right?

2) Using the anonymous FY2020 proposal Organizational ratings you provided, I did a very simple analysis--looking at the variation across "Org" dimensions and also across agency proposals. As you will see from the attached spreadsheet, my analysis leads me to offer two observations (with the caveat, of course, that they are based on only one year's worth of data!).

> 1) There was a good bit of consistency in Commissioners' ratings of Organizational "capacity" across proposals-- except when proposals were incomplete or non-responsive. Thus, Commissioners seem to be "of like mind" as they evaluate the Org dimensions, assuming a well-prepared proposal.
>
> 2) Commissioners were <u>least</u> consistent in their ratings of two Org dimensions--both of which are in the Financial category: #1 ("No Significant Issues Identified in Financial Statement") AND #5 ("Sufficient Level of Reserve Funds"). This observation held across responsive as well as non-responsive proposals. Thus, you may want to consider how to provide Commissioners with more support around these dimensions (e.g., detailed explanations of these dimensions--which could perhaps include examples).

Please don't hesitate to call or email me if you have questions about the analysis or if you want me to dig deeper into the data.

Sharon

Sharon Ford Schattgen

573.268.0004
sfschattgen@aol.com

📄 **ANALYSIS OF FY2020 HSC ORG   RATINGS.xlsx**
18K