



CITY OF TOPEKA

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

SOCIAL SERVICE GRANTS COMMITTEE

CITY COUNCIL
City Hall, 215 SE 7th Street, Suite 255
Topeka, KS 66603-3914
Tel: 785-368-3710
Fax: 785-368-3958
www.topeka.org

Date: July 22, 2022

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Classroom A; LEC 320 S. Kansas Ave (*virtual attendance option also offered*)

Committee members present: Councilmembers Karen Hiller (Chair), Brett Kell, Hannah Naeger

City staff present: Kalea Pauole (City Grants Administrator), Interim City Manager Bill Cochran, United Way vendor staff: Brett Martin, Jessica Lehnerr, Joyce Katzer, Juliet McDiffet

1) Call to Order

Chairwoman Hiller called the meeting to order at 10:00am. Committee members, City Staff, and United Way staff introduced themselves.

2) Approval of July 8, 2022 Minutes

Committee member Naeger made a motion to approve meeting minutes. Committee member Kell seconded the motion. Motion approved 3-0-0.

3) Agency Appeals

Chairwoman Hiller noted that three agencies had submitted letters to appeal. Agencies were called up to speak on their appeals. Chairwoman Hiller provided some background to the appeals process, stating that in some cases, if it is felt there was an error within the scoring, corrections may be made. However, it also may be a learning process for new programs or new directors.

NAMI Kansas – Sherrie Vaughn spoke on the Front Porch program, and to the services provided by NAMI Kansas for mental health assistance that is provided. Brett Martin, United Way, spoke to the scoring received related to the scoresheet category “Outcomes are clear and related to identified needs”. The grant Reviewers only have what is in front of them. If they do not have any quantitative information to score on, they are not able to provide a score for that section. Mr. Martin suggested reaching out to national or regional partners to inquire with them how they provide outcomes and outputs in a measurable way to put onto an

application. Ms. Vaughn confirmed she understood the information provided, however stated NAMI wanted to be cautious to not only use people as a data point or statistic, but rather to help individuals. Chairwoman Hiller suggested that obtaining data could be done in tandem with still providing the personal care and attention.

The scoresheet category “Applicant has achieved outputs and outcomes on prior grants - per meaningful measures” received a score of 10/20. Ms. Vaughn stated this section did not have any notes provided. Mr. Martin read the criteria for this section found on the scoring sheet. He noted that the scoring for this section is 20 points if 90% of the outcomes and goals are met; 15 points if 75% are met; 10 points if 50% are met; 5 points if 25% are met; and zero “0” points if none of the goals and outcomes are achieved. These percentages are rounded up to the next point threshold, if, for example it exceeds 50% it will roll into the 15 point threshold. Mr. Martin read over the application and noted only two of the four outcomes and goals appeared to be met, which would explain the 10 points score. Typically, this does not have a comment, as the percentage received is what it is attached to. His notes stated that staff who contacted the reference list for NAMI, stated 50% of the goals and outcomes had been met. Mr. Martin stated additional follow-up can be provided to Ms. Vaughn to provide clarification and the reference list.

Capacity - Organization “Organization has the resources to produce outcomes efficiently and effectively”. Ms. Vaughn referenced the scoresheet comment which stated “48% of funds are paying their rent, that’s almost half”. She clarified that although the rent for the Front Porch program is 48%, it is only about 2% of the NAMI Kansas agency budget. Mr. Martin stated the 48% of the proposal is from the funds that come from the SSG grant. There were a couple of comments that came from the Reviewers. Comment was that the West Ridge Mall was not a location with an ideal occupancy rate of being able to reach people who may benefit from the Front Porch program. Ms. Vaughn stated that there was a statistical rate that 1/5 people have a mental illness and that there is a ripple effect, where even if the mall had 100 people there daily, there could be twenty people suffering from mental illness that could benefit from the program, and that many other people could be informed about NAMI. Mr. Martin stated that it was felt that the Reviewers questioned if there was a better location for the program that would yield more contacts rather than the mall which is at a much more limited capacity than it once was.

“Organization manages program effectively” – Ms. Vaughn stated that the Front Porch program is listed on the NAMI website. Information about the program and its mission are also on the website. Mr. Martin stated there were a couple of grant Reviewers who were not able to find that information. Ms. Vaughn referenced a second comment made on this section which was related to the past program. Mr. Martin stated this score comes back to the outcomes piece. The Reviewers did not find enough data or convincing information to prove the Front Door program was effective in that location.

“Agency has a formal process and is using client input” – Ms. Vaughn stated that the Front Door program is 100% client input driven. Mr. Martin referenced the application and stated there was a lack of connection between the conversations with clients and how it shapes the program.

“Organization Leadership is strong and maintains community-based representation” – Mr. Martin stated the agency Board was lacking in the race and ethnicity categories of the representation criteria. They did meet the other requirements on the rubric.

Chairwoman Hiller reviewed that even a slight change in the scoring, it would not effect the ranking on the competitive scores. Mr. Martin confirmed it would not.

Papan’s Landing – Robin St. James introduced herself and stated she was the new director of Papan’s Landing as of July 1, 2022. She thanked Juliet McDiffet for her patience with questions.

Ms. St. James inquired about the comments found within the “Demonstrative Need” category, and inquired as to the comment “serving a community, doing it forever and have survived”? Ms. McDiffet suggested this comment was actually a compliment to the longevity of the center and programs to serve the community, even though everything that has gone on.

Ms. St. James inquired about the comment on the Services for the Elderly program application regarding surplus funding. The previous director had completed this application prior to Ms. St. James time with Papan’s Landing. Juliet McDiffett stated that, from the application, it appeared that whomever input the information, it appeared to show there was a surplus. She recommended that

when the application process began for the 2024 session, Ms. St. James reach out to United Way for assistance.

Chairwoman Hiller noted that Deb Dawkins with the East Topeka Senior Center, was able to achieve a score of 100/100, which was the first time ever. She gave “kudos” to Ms. Dawkins for all of her work on learning about the process, and encouraged Ms. St. James to reach out to United Way as well.

Kansas Big Brothers Big Sisters – Eric Maydew wanted to speak to a few of the differences in this application. In the first section “Outputs are clear and related to identified needs” showed a score reduction of two points. Mr. Maydew stated the information had not changed, nor did the database or outcomes module used, and inquired as to why the scoring would be lower for this cycle? Mr. Martin read from the application and stated the outcomes were listed at 90%, and referenced a conversation with the grant Reviewers that was related to the output of the youth meeting the match anniversary. Ms. McDiffett stated she did not see anything listed on the comments from the Reviewers. She noted that this area was subjective, and with new Reviewers, it may not have seemed strong enough. Mr. Maydew added that the youth being reported on area are in specific areas, and would change from year-to-year, and is not reflective of all youth served but only reflective of the youth served in the territory the application specifies. Mr. Martin read from the scoring sheet; “Outputs are demonstrated in detail and are achievable” is 10 points and “Outputs are general or vague” is 8 points. He stated the Reviewers may have found more specific detail for the outputs in this section would have been helpful. Mr. Martin noted additional information related to why the match anniversary and to the youth in the activity facing adversity and one-on-one mentoring may be helpful. Mr. Maydew requested this information be reconsidered during the post-appeal process.

“Plan has been identified to measure outputs and outcomes” – Mr. Maydew noted he felt this was likely a similar reason for the two-point reduction as what was docked in the previous area. Mr. Martin noted this could have been related to the youth and completion of surveys, as a means for measure, and if there was specificity in terms of how KBBBS is ensuring youth are completing the surveys. Mr. Maydew stated this was similar to the service territory promised in the application and also depends on match length and when those occur.

“Achievement of outcomes and outputs on prior grants for meaningful measures”
- Mr. Maydew noted this section received a score of 10/20. Mr. Martin reviewed the application and stated that the first output anticipated 100 and actual was 61. The other outcome stated that by December 31, 2023 there would be a 90% outcome, and there was a 93% achieved, so KBBBS did meet that outcome goal but it was the 61 out of 100 that pulled the score down in this section.

“Organization has the resources to produce outcomes efficiently and effectively”
- This section received a score of 5/10 with a comment of a huge budget surplus in 2021 and the cost of service per child is very high. Mr. Martin noted it appeared to show a budget surplus of \$105K in 2021. And a surplus in 2022 and projected surplus in 2023, which were not quite to the same degree. Mr. Maydew inquired if the reasoning was that because KBBBS has a large surplus, less funding is needed? Mr. Martin and Joyce Katzer, United Way, confirmed. Mr. Maydew added some clarification stating that, of the \$105K, \$60K was received as part of the COVID-19 relief grant, and is one-time revenue received. Additionally, there were two staff gone for over nine months that same year, so revenue related to those salaries was not being paid out for that period of time. He noted that the 2023 projections reflected an assumption that the full \$25,000 award from the Social Service Grants would be provided. However, if they are awarded the \$17K currently recommended, it would then move this into a negative projection. Mr. Martin appreciated the clarification, and noted there was an indication about a matching gifts challenge in 2021. Mr. Maydew noted they did not know when those match opportunities would occur, nor would have any say as to what those funds would be allowed to go toward.

Chairwoman Hiller noted it may be worth reviewing the question as it is written to allow for clarification for the 2024 cycle. Mr. Martin stated that the language to the question for the budget narrative could probably be cleaned up to encourage thinking of those types of situation.

“Past grant administration is effective” - Mr. Maydew sought additional clarification on this scoring. Mr. Martin stated this section was scored internally, by United Way. Ms. McDuffett noted there was one instance where KBBBS was late on reporting, which is why the scoring was what it was. Mr. Martin noted that they followed the City’s example of that scoring which docked points from a 5 to a 3 if there are any late pieces.

Mr. Maydew stated that the program was back to full staffing capacity, and was hopeful for the 2024 process.

4) Review & Approve Scoring and Funding Recommendations

Chairwoman Hiller inquired if there were any additional discussion or questions for the appeals.

Committee member Naeger thanked the organizations who appealed, and all of the applicant organizations for the work that they do for our community.

MOTION: To affirm the scoring and funding recommendations from the United Way and City Staff to the Governing Body. Committee member Naeger made the motion. Committee member Kell seconded the motion. Motion approved 3-0-0.

5) Other Items

Chairwoman Hiller referenced the next meeting, as it was intended to review community services. She inquired if Mr. Martin had any suggestions for timelines. Mr. Martin stated August or September would be best for them.

Chairwoman Hiller sought public comment. There was none.

6) Adjourn

Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:15am.

Meeting video can be viewed at: <https://youtu.be/oMRxTxrNTpk>