

City of Columbia, Missouri

*701 E. Broadway
Columbia, Missouri*



Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, May 14, 2019

7:00 PM

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

Human Services Commission

I. CALL TO ORDER

Camp called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

First moved to approve the April 9, 2019 meeting minutes. Suhler seconded the motion and, without opposition, the motion passed.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. City of Columbia Social Services Funding

Hollis stated he had emailed the revised guidelines report to the commission members prior to the May 6th City Council meeting. He said Council had positive feedback about the process being more agile. Hollis stated he forwarded a more in depth report, about the revisions, to contracted providers, and forwarded that report to the commission. Hollis said some providers sought clarification, but no concerns were expressed.

Ford entered at 7:06 PM

B. FY2020 Social Services Funding Allocation

Hollis stated Schattgen would be providing a presentation on her analysis of the proposal ratings. Schattgen stated Hollis had provided her with three years of anonymous ratings. Schattgen stated she explored two questions. Are we using the entire range of the 3 and 4 point scales as we rate proposals? Are there proposal categories that would allow us to use a different scale? Schattgen stated she did not consider the following questions. Are individual raters consistent as they use the rating scale across and/or within proposals (i.e., intra-rater reliability)? Are we as a group consistent in our ratings within proposals (i.e., inter-rater reliability)? How does the type of proposal impact our use of the rating scale?

Schattgen stated that in the organization ratings, there were very few "poor" ratings. She said she wondered if that was because of the great work of the staff or if the agencies that came to the City knew how tough the criteria were coming into the proposal process. Schattgen stated this means the commissioners are typically only using two of the three scale points. She recommended for the organization ratings use a dichotomous scale, as that's how commissioners generally have been rating these criteria. Schattgen stated a dichotomous rating might work in the program ratings for the criterion regarding citations. She said she would like to work on further defining the program criteria, but needs a social services person to look at that with her. Hollis stated the United Way's rubric uses half points on a 10 point scale. Hollis stated the idea of an even numbered scale keeps people out of the middle. Camp agreed that when there was a scale of 3, a lot of the orgs and programs came back as 2's. Hollis stated that 2019 seemed cleaner and said it might be because the process changed and ratings were submitted after the discussion at the October work session. Schattgen said that since the commission is working to change the structure of funding, it made sense to look at this process now and get some questions answered now. Hollis stated his recommendation for organization ratings would be a two point scale of 0 and 1. He said this should be neutral to the size of the

agency. Ford wondered if the agency board ratio information, tax information, financial statement, etc. shouldn't be rated. Schattgen agreed that she liked the idea of certain criteria being met, and not rated.

Jones entered at 7:29 PM

There was discussion about financial statements versus audits and the information gleaned from that documentation. Jones said he could tolerate each commissioner not conceptualizing each criterion in the same way and wondered if what the commissioners were leaning towards was a pre-screener for Hollis to filter the applications through. Hollis wondered about a middle ground in which more specific criteria were used but the commission would still rate the criteria. Hollis asked Suhler if the criterion "financial statement" should be more specific. Suhler said the commission could ask for an income statement and about things like cash flow, a balance sheet showing assets vs. liabilities, and the amount of debt. Jones asked about weighting different sections. Hollis stated that citations were a perfect example of this, as that shouldn't make or break the proposal. He stated that when the City started requiring performance measures they had used a multiplier to weight that criterion. Camp stated that she didn't want the process to be so flat that the commission was useless. Jones said he thought the 0-1 idea was solid. Ford asked to move the conversation forward. Hollis stated the values might be 0 and 1, but the language could be more descriptive and unique to each criterion. Hollis stated the commission could decide on some specific guidelines for each criterion, like 50% of funding coming from sources outside the City of Columbia. He said he wouldn't want the commission to only rate the programs because the capacity and quality of the agencies providing the programs is really important. Hollis asked if each organization criterion should be broken out with its own scale, or if the commission wanted to keep rating the criteria in two groups. Ford asked, if the commission has consistently rated agencies "ok," what would change if the scale changed. Schattgen said she suggested breaking up the criteria and rating each one as she thought the moderate scores came from having to rate the all of the items as a whole. Jones asked about the timeline for these changes. Hollis stated the revision would need to be completed so they can be included in the RFP. Hollis asked if the commission wanted to change the scale and what the new scale should be. Jones suggested forming a sub-committee. Hollis stated he could develop draft options, with input from interested commissioners, and provide those for consideration at the June meeting. Hollis stated if they are not approved at the June meeting, they would need to be approved at the July meeting. Hollis asked if there was consensus to use a binary scale for the organization ratings. There was no opposition to this approach. Hollis said anyone who wants to work on this project should email him soon after the meeting. Camp thanked Schattgen for her work on analyzing the ratings. Hollis also thanked Schattgen for her work and her presentation. Hollis stated he would like to flesh out the idea of establishing a rubric for organization finances and it might be possible to partner with the county and United Way to do so.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI. REPORTS

A. Community Development Commission

Suhler stated that not too much is happening at the Community Development Commission right now. The housing task force finished their work. The fair housing commission is going to continue to meet semiannually. Last week the commission heard presentations from Parks and Rec and Public Works for

funding, and she questioned the need for their funding request. She said there would be more presentation proposals for non-city agencies on June 5th. She said Cole stated there was \$1.7 million in CBDG funding applications, and only about \$924,000 in funds available.

B. Staff Report

Hollis stated he is working with Compass, Phoenix, and Job Point on revised performance measures in an attempt to align measures across the City, County, and United Way. Hollis said he is still waiting for a revised budget from SIL. Hollis said he will start working on the FY2020 RFP, which he said will be pretty much the same as in the past, but with the new issue area title Basic Needs. Hollis said the new Administrative Assistant has been hired, and the department is experimenting with placing the position under the Administrative Supervisor so that a strengths based approach can be utilized.

VII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Hollis stated this is First's last meeting and thanked First for his service to the commission and to the community

VIII. NEXT MEETING DATE

June 11, 2019

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-CITY (573-874-2489) or email CITY@CoMo.gov. 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.