

## CDBG TASK FORCE

### Minutes

Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room, City Hall

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

2:00pm – 3:00pm

#### **Attendance:**

<b>Task Force Members</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Taneaia Dowell	X	
Howard Evergreen	X	
Kathy Johnson Harris	X	
Joy Johnson		X
Sherry Kraft	X	
Kelly Logan	X	
Sarah Malpass	X	
Megan Renfro		X
Matthew Slaats	X	
Tierra Howard (staff)	X	
<b>Others:</b>		

The meeting began at 2:00pm. The group members began introductions.

#### **Task Force Questions**

Staff provided asked the Task Force (TF) if there were any questions before reviewing scores. Tierra Howard (TH) explained that the SAT reviews the economic develop proposals and that they would be reviewing the CIC proposal. Sherry asked for an explanation of question #5 regarding how the point system works. TH explained that recipients of FY 15 funds could get up to 10 points on #5, non-recipients or new applicants would receive 5 points (neutral score) and then would have the opportunity to gain 5 additional points in the next question (posed to non-recipients of FY 15 funds).

There was discussion about how many of the proposals received (from applicants that received FY 15 funds) did not answer #5 or report on FY 15 outcomes. TH explained that she has the data on FY 15 outcomes, however, TH expressed that it is up to the TF to decide if it would like to provide a score based solely on the application response versus scoring on additional information provided by staff or other group members. Howard Evergreen (HE) explained that he would like to have additional information from staff on outcomes because he would not like to penalize an applicant on a misunderstanding. Sarah Malpass (SM) explained that OAR and PACEM answered the question fully but she did not see the information from City of Promise. TH explained that she could share the information.

Taneaia Dowell (TD) asked if the TF is supposed to utilize the beneficiary information that was included in the staff report. TH explained that some of the information in relation to beneficiaries was unclear in the proposals, therefore questions about the number of those to be served were sent out as applicant questions and responses were distributed to the

group. TH explained that as the TF reviews the applications, she can share the responses with the group.

SM explained that for item #7 on the evaluation, she was unsure how to evaluate the proposals based on key words of “evidence-based practices” and “best practices and/or research) because many of the proposals did not include the key words. TH explained that difference between best practices, solid research on the effectiveness of strategies, and evidence-based strategies. She explained that evidence-based strategies would be strategies in which there are proven scientific (specific) results and best practices would be using models from other programs/places that were successful (more of a general consensus). Matthew Slaats (MS) explained that evidence-based strategies would have numbers to support the strategies whereas best practices would be more of a verbal suggestion or idea. TH explained that next year it would be helpful to have the questions of clarification from the TF when the evaluation tool is sent out so that the tool can be revised or staff can provide clarification prior to the evaluation of proposals. The TF agreed that the evaluation tool improved from the previous year.

HE stated that it is difficult to determine organizational capacity on paper. Kelly Logan (KL) explained that some of the items on the evaluations are hard to quantify into a number, however, she was in hopes that the discussion would help with quantifying a score. TH explained that meeting with the organization is an option. HE explained that he thinks that the group has enough information to make an informed decision.

### **Review of Preliminary Scores for Public Service Proposals**

#### City of Promise – Enrolled to Launch Proposal

The group shared preliminary scores for items #1 – 10 on the evaluation tool and discussed why certain scores were given.

- [#2] Sherry Kraft (SK) explained that the domain of the program and what it is trying to accomplish is broader than childcare and the program has proven to fit within the goals of the Consolidated Plan and priority neighborhood and the goals are very broad for the families (children and parents) and it is hitting the mark. HE stated that the broadness of the response made it more difficult to provide a high score. TD explained that she looked at the Council Priority, however, SK explained that the specific question is asking about the high priority need. HE explained that the question asks the applicant to demonstrate how the program will address the need and it was so broad that he was unable to determine how the program would meet the need. TD disagreed and stated that they explained what they were going to do and how they would meet the needs (help enroll children) and that the program is helping the City schools in meeting their goals. MS explained that he scored low because he was confused. TH explained that the question is specifically related to the high priority need and not consolidated plan goal (in previous question). SM asked what the reasoning is for asking if it meets a consolidated plan goal, TH explained that the program has to meet a consolidated plan goal to be eligible for CDBG. SM explained that the TF should not be so rigid in scoring because the program ties to supporting job improvement and quality childcare. HE explained that he had difficulty identifying what the broader CoP programming was, TD explained that the proposal did a good job in identifying what it offers and the

successes. MS explained that there was no place on the evaluation to evaluate grammatical errors and TD stated that that issue does not give her heartburn.

- [#3] SK explained that she was confused because the timeline was not clear. TH explained that she believes that the dates are an oversight error. KL explained that she did not see as much detail. The group decided that they would like to stick to providing an average score versus a consensus score.
- [#4] MS explained that the proposal did not clearly describe the answer to the question. KL agreed. SK asked the group, how is performance indicators being define and she suggested that the TF is probably not defining it in the same way. SK stated that the application provided specific answers related to reading benchmarks (reading assessments) and no children will enter kindergarten with less than 15 hours/week of preschool. SK stated that she may have a biased view because she reviews reports that have the information in them so she knows it but CoP did not explain it in their proposal. SM explained that the application did a good job in showing how CoP is shifting the bar. HE explained that he felt that the discussion is important for someone who does not know about CoP.
- [#5] TD explained that she was unable to identify actual outcomes from the application, however, the staff report provided the actuals. TD asked if we are supposed to go by what is provided in the application versus what the staff report provided. HE stated that he thinks that other information should be included in the evaluation process and that we should not be so rigid. Kathy Johnson Harris (KJH) stated that the group could have asked staff to find out the actual outcomes from CoP, however, staff provided the information upfront therefore the information should be used. KL stated that it was not reported, so she gave a score of a 0. TH explained that they were not the only applicant that missed the question. TD stated that she agreed with KL. She stated if we are only using what was provided in the application, then the score for her is a 0. TD suggested that the group provide a decision on what information to use to provide a score. SM stated that maybe we should provide some flexibility because they were not the only applicant who missed the question, she suggested that perhaps there was confusion about the question. SM stated that she would provide a higher score due to the fact that they did meet their goals, however, she suggested that next year it should be made clear to the applicant that if the applicant does not provide an answer as to how it met its goals and of outcomes of the previous funding, perhaps they should be penalized/disqualified from the process. SM stated that CoP did not answer the question but they did provide outcome data in other sections. KJH asked if staff can provide the applicants feedback to brush up on skills so that if applicants apply for other grants, they will have that knowledge.
- [#7] TD explained that some of the needs were identified in other areas,
- [#8] HE stated that he could not identify the rigorous evaluation score in the application. SK stated that they did adequately explain their evaluation system. KL stated that it was hard to determine the rigorous nature of the evaluation system in the application. TD explained that they did provide outcome information under question #19. SK stated that they explained how they are using a data system similar to other promise neighborhood programs and also working with City schools to report on data/evaluate. KL stated that she fully supports CoP's efforts and if it was a yes or no of whether or not to provide funding, she would say yes, however, she felt as though the application did not answer a lot of the questions. KL stated that there is a lot of information that they could provide, but it is not being

provided in the application. MS feels that the application perhaps was not written by an experienced grant writer (weak application). SK stated that perhaps the group was looking at different things but she felt as though they described their data collection system but others felt it was not adequate as a description of their evaluation system. TH stated that perhaps the source of confusion amongst the group is that the question asked them how the evaluation system informs their program and that information was not clear.

- [#9] SK stated it's hard to assess the financial benefits as they are long-term. HE stated that the conversation has helped increase his score. MS stated that it is hard to assess financial benefits in this program because benefits occur long term, however, other applications were able to assess the financial benefits (where this application was lacking that information). TD stated that the program budget leverages 16 percent of alternative funds, which does not seem like a lot of funding from other sources, however, she stated that she can see how the program could assist with generating revenue for the City long-term but the application did not answer the question or provide enough detailed information. SM explained that she felt like the application did not use key words from the question to answer the questions.
- [#10] SM stated that the application did not mention MOU or formal partnership agreement. SK stated that they do work with ReadyKids and the school system, which was mentioned in the application.
- [#11] SM stated that since the program is targeted outside of the SIA, she did not know how to answer it. KJH stated that it is outside of the SIA, however, the majority of the kids that they are serving are transient. SM suggested that for next year we may want to change the question. SK asked if this question was in place to differentiate the SIA from the priority neighborhood. TH explained that when Council set priorities they specifically stated that they wanted to see workforce development funds tied towards PHA and CRHA residents within the SIA area. There was a discussion about whether the other applications specifically stated that they would assist beneficiaries living within the SIA area. SM stated that OAR did specifically discuss doing outreach in the SIA area. HE stated that OAR's application stated that OAR did not describe that it would be using the funds to specifically target residents within the SIA area.

KL stated that we had an intense discussion about how to score applications based on specific facts and information provided. She stated that she had framed her scoring based upon last year's discussion regarding using facts and information provided in the proposal. She stated that this year, it seems as though we are not providing scores based on the information provided in the proposal (more flexible). She stated that the group needs decide what approach it will be taking to score the evaluations (we are not being consistent). SM stated that she believes that we have not ever decided on an approach. MS stated that it would be helpful for staff to take the averages and focus on numbers that the group does not agree on. KJH stated that she agrees with KL, however, when you have an open end to discuss, it allows you to be flexible. TD stated that she is trying to leave out her personal knowledge about the organization and she is using the proposal to score. SM asked if we can submit out scores based upon the application submissions and then discuss flexibility about the scores that have major differences. SK asked if any of the groups requested technical assistance. TH stated that PACEM was the only organization that she met with. SK stated that she is okay with the approach that SM stated. SK stated that she

was looking for the answer in the application under different questions. TH stated that she will tabulate all TF member scores, distribute them to the TF, point out the major point differences (3-4 points), and then the TF can focus discussion on areas where scores differed and then TF members who wish to change their scores can do so. TD stated that we just ask if we can go off of the information that was provided. KJH stated that when she evaluated the applications, that she used what was provided in the application. She stated that if we submit forms to TH and she tabulates them (based on the submission), then we can discuss the areas where there are differences and that should satisfy TD and KL's concerns. MS stated that the larger concern is that the estimated budget is \$55,696 and we have requests of up to \$80,000. He stated that we should move quickly through the evaluations and focus more on funding amounts/recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15pm.