



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes - Final

Human Services Commission

Tuesday, April 19, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Ford called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Introductions were made.

Present: 9 - Amy Camp, Tonia Compton, Nathan First, Stacy Ford, Mark Jones, Sharon Schattgen, Diane Suhler, Justin Thomas and Peggie Wood

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Jones moved to approve the agenda. Suhler seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF MARCH 15, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Thomas moved to approve the minutes. Jones seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. City Social Services Funding Policy

Hollis stated the final draft version of the policy was sent to the commission members. Ford asked if there were any questions regarding the policy. Camp moved to approve the policy. First asked if the applicant has any leeway to back out of a contract. Hollis stated yes. Hollis stated the applicant or the City could choose to terminate a contract provided 30 days notice was given. First asked the language be revised for clarity. Hollis said the sample contract provided this information but the policy could be updated to reflect this as well. Hollis stated the policy included highlights of the contract, not all the details. Hollis stated the contract was a one year agreement with the option for two, one-year renewals. Hollis stated he could mirror the contract language if the commission preferred this. Jones stated this should be done for consistency. Jones stated the City does not pay out ahead of time. Hollis stated the City does pay out ahead of time with an initial payment. Suhler asked if all the conditions for the renewals were stipulated in the contract. Hollis stated yes, the City may renew the contract at its discretion. Hollis stated there were too many reasons why the City may want to terminate the contract so those specifics were not listed. Hollis stated another option would be to omit the sentence on the policy regarding terminating the contract. Wood stated the sentence was clear. Jones and Schattgen agreed.

Camp moved to approve the policy as amended. First seconded the motion and without opposition the motion passed.

B. FY2017 Social Services Funding Allocation Process

Hollis provided copies of the draft RFP process. Hollis stated one change moved the information session from August 1st to July 29th. Hollis stated the preliminary work session was removed, the allocation determination meeting would be in November, and the proposal discussion would be in October. Hollis stated this process reflected the policy. Jones asked if the schedule was firm. Hollis stated no. Jones stated the November session did not interfere with the election. Hollis stated the Health Department was a polling place, and a meeting would not be scheduled on an election day. There was consensus to adopt the proposed process.

Hollis stated he is working toward the goal of having the ability to enter proposal comments and responses in the funding management system. Hollis stated this idea still needed to be presented to Social Solutions. Hollis stated a potential privacy concern would be the ability of the public to see the comments but Hollis stated the records were closed until the contracts are executed. Hollis stated the commissioner would still be writing their comments to bring to the October meeting and at the meeting the comments would be merged and cleaned and entered in the system. Hollis stated there would be a comment portion in every section but not for every item. Hollis stated the commissioners would still be given ratings worksheets, and then asked to enter scores in the system. Ford stated the commissioners often have concerns that just need clarifying and do not need to be provided to the agency. Camp stated the commissioner comments did not need to be included. Hollis stated the commission could consolidate their comments before he entered them, and then he would notify the agencies that the comments were available. Schattgen asked when Hollis would know if the change on the comment fields was possible.

Hollis stated all three funders agreed to the revised forms which were sent to Social Solutions. Hollis said he should have an idea of a timeline by the end of the week. Hollis provided copies of the Program Narrative. Hollis stated Item C, Best Practices and Standards, was revised by adding standards, citing from reputable sources, and the logic that follows. Hollis stated agencies will need to specify if they are aware of best practices, if they use best practices, and why or why not. Schattgen asked if there was any possibility for defining the word reputable. Hollis stated the issue was that some best practices and standards did not have a way they were evaluated or vetted through a peer review process. First stated there was a possible issue with agencies gaining access to peer reviewed journals. Hollis stated one solution was accepting credible government sources. First stated it was a process for agencies to learn what was acceptable and should get better each year. Ford asked if agencies would be directed to accessible information. Hollis stated yes. Hollis stated this issue was not due so much to the size of the agency but the capacity. Hollis stated United Way could address this issue as they pursue capacity building. Hollis stated it was suggested to connect with the University in order to provide an avenue for peer reviewed materials. Ford stated agencies would need this information for other grants as well. Hollis stated this may need to be more of an organic process. Camp stated the commission probably questions the wording more than the applicants would. Thomas asked about the wording under Best Practices. Hollis stated there was a sentence missing in that portion, and he would revise it. Schattgen asked if the agency should express their rationale for what best practices were used. Camp suggested different wording for the Best Practices portion. Schattgen asked

about the character limit in the fields. Hollis stated this would be tested. Schattgen suggested the Best Practices portion be tested as well. Hollis stated he would work on this and revise. Hollis stated all this information would be made public, and there would be no advantage gained in the testing process. Ford asked if there were any other issues with the narrative, and there were none. Hollis passed out copies of the Program Information form. Hollis stated the main change was consolidating five forms down to two forms. Hollis stated this could not be consolidated down to one form, because this would result in too many fields in the system. Hollis stated he sent the contract form to the commissioners. Hollis stated the contract form would auto populate from the Program Information form, and this was another reason to keep two separate proposal forms. Hollis stated this would allow for the contract to be automatically built and the reports populated in the system. Hollis stated that previously, changes could not be made in the system without changing the original proposal. Hollis stated the two government funders preferred the original proposal be protected. Hollis stated the contract form was a part of the process to protect the original proposal. Hollis stated the Program Information form consolidates the budget, program service levels, consumer demographics and program services. Hollis stated that previously, the performance measures were included with each service but in the revised Program Information form they are only included for the entire program. Hollis stated there was now a single logic model for the program. Hollis stated the new forms would tie the goals to the outcomes. Ford asked if there were any other issues. First stated there was a typo on page 5 of the Program Information form. First stated some agencies skipped the program budget narratives the previous year. Hollis stated these were new fields so he was a bit more lenient last year but would enforce this more actively this year. Thomas stated the system should require this field be complete. Hollis stated each line item now has a narrative, and these narratives would be required if the line item was complete. Schattgen stated there was an additional typo on page 5 of the Program Information form. Schattgen asked if the commission members should proofread the documents. Hollis stated this assistance would be appreciated. Schattgen asked when the documents could be reviewed. Hollis stated he would make all the corrections and forward to the commission members on Wednesday. Hollis stated these forms would be made available as Word documents, and this was another reason why the proofreading was necessary. Hollis stated some agencies preferred to work with Word documents or print individual documents. Hollis stated the instructions had to be reviewed as well, but were easier to correct at a later date. Hollis stated the logic and fields needed to be complete for Social Solutions. Schattgen asked if the commission members should test the logic. Hollis stated the logic test could not be completed until the system was built. Hollis asked who would be willing to proofread and Wood, Schattgen, and First agreed to complete this task. Hollis provided copies of the Proposal Ratings forms. Hollis stated the commission would review the Organizational Criteria first. Hollis stated the commission would get a worksheet for the organization and a worksheet for the program, because the organization was only rated once even if there were several programs. Hollis stated one change completed was regarding the citations. Hollis stated First suggested the changes be more inclusive. Hollis stated there were formerly bullet points under the program description portion, but this has been broken up to include quality improvement process and consumer feedback. Hollis stated this would directly reflect the proposal form. Hollis stated the United Way was also interested in quality improvement performance measures. Hollis stated the form in the system would have to be changed, but would need to be finalized at the next meeting. Hollis asked if

there were any issues with the changes. Suhler asked if there was any way the agencies could look at their previous results. Hollis stated this was the point in breaking up the items and adding additional items on the forms. Suhler asked if there was an explicit question about past experience informing change. Hollis stated this question would be an issue for new programs. Thomas asked if agencies returning for funds could be required to provide some narrative about this. Ford asked if the agencies could be asked about assessment tools and outcomes. Hollis stated the logic model would include the assessment, and the quality improvement portion would lead to that circular model. First asked if the agencies could be asked about strategies for quality improvement. Hollis stated this was already asked as item G. Hollis stated the responses from the agencies would inform the United Way's capacity building efforts. Hollis stated a specific explanation of the definition of a quality improvement process may be necessary.

Hollis provided copies of the Description of Proposal Ratings. Hollis stated the long term solution would be to create a rubric. Hollis stated different organization rating criteria were necessary. Compton stated the commission members should be evaluating the organization and not what was put on the application. Hollis stated that previously, the organization capacity score was a part of the total score. Hollis stated a five point scale was considered. First stated it was difficult to evaluate a high quality, high capacity organization versus a low quality, high capacity program. Hollis stated organizational profile was broken up into two general categories including general information and financial information. Hollis stated a rubric would contain a description with each item, but this would be a huge project. Hollis stated the commission members would have to decide the ratings. Schattgen stated holistic grading was not outside of best practices. Hollis stated the organizational capacity process was being dropped. Hollis stated the rubric could be completed in the future based in part on the previous evaluation criteria. Camp stated the current form was adequate for now. Compton asked about adding a zero to the rating scale. Hollis stated this had been discussed before, and the United Way uses the scale 0-2. Compton stated she preferred the zero to be a part of the scale. Hollis stated formerly, the proposals were accepted as incomplete which would warrant a zero score. However, Hollis said now only complete proposals were accepted so the thinking was a zero score was not necessary. Hollis stated the staff reviews submitted proposals for completeness before they are forwarded to the commission members for review. Hollis stated he and First and provided different options for the ratings description language. Compton stated option 1 would allow her to best evaluate the proposal. Camp stated she preferred option 1. Schattgen stated there was a school of thought which discouraged the use of an odd number of ratings on a scale. Schattgen stated a four point rubric was generally used in large scale assessment evaluations. Camp asked what should be done about the ratings scale. Hollis stated the commission members needed to select an option to remain on the ratings sheet. Ford asked for a show of hands to vote for an option, and option 1 had the most votes. Ford asked if there were any changes to option 1. Hollis asked if point 5 should be dropped from the ratings scale. Ford asked if there was a consensus to drop point 5. First stated the wording "very good" should be removed. Hollis asked if Schattgen could share the value of going to a four point system. Schattgen stated a four point system would keep ratings from falling in the middle as well as defining the scale points. Hollis stated a consensus was necessary in order to make the change. Camp asked if the change would determine a more accurate picture. Schattgen stated it would. First stated he would like to go to a four point rating scale. Jones stated the score was important but was never the final funding decision. Hollis stated the

commission rarely compared programs serving the same populations or providing the same services. Schattgen stated the ratings allow the commission to defend their decision. Hollis agreed. Camp stated the commission makes recommendations only, not the final decision. Schattgen stated the ratings could also help agencies with program improvement.. Ford asked what the labels on the points in the rating scale should be. There was a consensus to use the labels poor, fair, good, and excellent as well as a consensus to adopt the four point rating scale.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI. STAFF REPORT

Hollis stated the Adult Day Connection submitted a revised sliding fee scale, as requested by staff, due to the underutilization of City contract funds. Hollis stated he would make all corrections to the documents and forward to the commission members for review and proofreading. Hollis stated this needed to be complete by the next meeting.

VII. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION REPRESENTATIVE REPORT

Jones stated the commission did not meet this month due to the bus tour of various projects completed in the past. Jones stated he could facilitate a tour if any commission members were interested. Jones stated there was progress made on the sidewalk project and bus shelter project. Jones stated construction of low income housing included consideration of sustainability and low environmental impact. Jones stated the projects included multiple agencies in the community such as Job Point. Jones stated Universal Design has been adopted. Hollis stated this means that persons with disabilities can live in these homes but also serve persons as they age in place. Jones stated Universal Design includes wider doorways and lower counter tops. Jones stated the bus tour occurs once a year. Hollis stated both commissions try to use parallel processes and complimentary policies in order to avoid duplicate efforts. Hollis stated Jones was tasked with keeping communication open between the commissions.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None.

X. FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

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.