



## **Human Services Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes**

Renton City Hall  
Council Conference Room, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
March 18, 2014, 3:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Shannon Matson called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. A quorum was present.

**ATTENDANCE:** In Attendance: Shannon Matson, Chair; Linda Smith, Vice-Chair; Leslie Anderson; Elyn Blandón; Len Aron; Ryan McIrvin; Brook Lindquist; Amy Koehl. Excused: Chad Beuchler; Dorothy Capers  
City of Renton Staff: Karen Bergsvik; Dianne Utecht; Jennifer Jorgenson.

### **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Shannon asked for a motion to approve the February 18, 2014, minutes as presented. Elyn moved for approval; Linda seconded. Motion carried.

### **DECISIONS THIS MEETING**

Karen explained the funding applications are due April 23, 2014. Staff will have the applications copied and compiled by May 13<sup>th</sup>.

#### **A. Guidelines**

Shannon went over the draft guidelines for this funding cycle and that it is an agreement on a set of norms. She asked if there were any additions.

Additions from members:

- Be respectful and mindful. Don't dominate the conversation, and be concise.
- Ask questions for clarity – actively seek clarification. There are no dumb questions.
- Be aware of the possible need to recuse yourself to avoid a possible conflict of interest.
- Be aware of what is working well and not working well, for input into future funding processes.
- Members should strive for awareness of initiatives occurring that may impact future budget cycles.
- Keep comments on a professional level. Don't focus on the abilities of the grant writer.

There was discussion about members taking really good notes to provide justification for their ranking.

It was requested that staff bring the draft revised guidelines to the April meeting.

#### **B. Funding process decisions:**

How much funding should the highest ranking application in each Result area receive?

The highest ranked application will not be funded at either the amount of funding previously received or at the requested level. This will be left to the discretion of the review team. It was felt that it was arbitrary and limited flexibility.

Can programs be funded for more than what was requested?

No.

Can programs be funded out of rank order?

The group decided the response is No. Applications will be funded by rank order in each Result area, from highest to lowest, and no skipping.

Can a team move funds around in the Result areas that they are reviewing applications for?

No. If there are excess/unallocated funds within a Result area, they will be returned to the whole group to decide how they should be allocated.

Will clarifying questions to agencies be asked?

No. It was felt that there is not sufficient time to do this, and it was a question of fairness. It was requested that we add a Frequently Asked Questions to the Renton website, and be clear that the responses only apply to Renton. Technical questions will be addressed on the Sharepoint website.

Do we use the performance of agencies and their submitted reports in the rating process?

No. This will not be part of the rating. Staff shared that there was no correlation between agencies that needed a lot of help in the funding process, and those that were late in their reporting requirements. There is also a natural consequence of agencies not getting paid if they don't submit the invoices. There was discussion as to if past performance should be weighted or not, if agencies were close in their ratings. It was decided not to do this. Members asked that there be a review at the end of the funding process to see if the ratings would have changed at all, if this had remained part of the rating process.

Do we fund strictly on the application and the ratings?

It was decided to table this subject until we can look at it in context. It had to do with the ten points given to Community Impact, and the criteria used for the rating. Options are: maintain the ten points, eliminate it, revise the criteria to make it more explicit, and revise the points assigned to it.

There was discussion regarding: how do members know enough about the agency to do this rating? How do members know what does or doesn't come out in the application? Agencies requested that the criteria be clearer. There was a wide variance among team members in the scores in the last funding cycle; it was felt that with only two groups, there would be less variance, and more scores to average.

#### **2014 CAPACITY BUILDING UPDATE**

Dianne shared about the South King County funding workshop that was held on March 12<sup>th</sup>. There were a number of new agencies that attended. David Daw from the South King Council of Human Services will be conducting training for agencies on how to complete the application, and also will be reviewing written applications. Renton staff suggested that David contact certain agencies that might need additional assistance with the application; he has already made contact with them.

#### **SENIOR STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE**

Dianne reviewed the planning process and stated they are holding focus group meetings to develop a strategic plan for older adults in the community. Members were asked if they would be kept informed about the plan, and staff said yes; it overlaps with human services as we fund services for older adults, and also the needs fit into the *Human Services Needs Assessment*.

#### **OTHER INFORMATION**

Karen will invite Mayor Law to speak at the April meeting. Members were encouraged by Shannon to think of questions they would like to ask him.

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Shannon Matson, Chair

NEXT REGULAR MEETING: APRIL 15, 2014, 3:00 p.m. Council Conference Room 7th Floor Renton City Hall