

THE COMMUNITY RESOURCE COALITION

REVIEW OF COALITION'S GRANT PLAN DEVELOPMENT, SOLICITATION, AND FUNDING RECOMMENDATION PROCESS

Grant Description, Application, and Rubric Development

The Community Resource Coalition's (CRC) first three meetings, September 6th, September 26th, and October 7th focused on developing the Program and Application Outline, the Application, and the Rubric for Scoring.

September 6, 2022, Meeting

Mayor Sheehy kicked the meeting off to elect a chair and vice-chair.

Staff presented a draft grant program, a draft REQUEST FOR APPLICATION, and a basic scoring rubric to the CRC. The CRC discussed program design, program criteria, and scoring rubric. The CRC discussed ***right-sizing the process to our community*** and directed staff to add a fillable application to the grant program. They felt an application that asked all applicants the same questions would assist organizations with minimal experience with the grant application. In addition, they discussed that the rubric was too general and felt each point should be scored.

The CRC directed staff to develop an application with these criteria: community need, program sustainability, program evaluation, organization, and partnership.

The CRC also directed staff to develop a rubric that scored each point within the criteria.

September 26, 2022, Meeting

Staff presented a draft application and updated rubric to the CRC.

The CRC discussed whether funding should be allocated in each priority focus area. The CRC discussed whether a letter of inquiry or holding a community meeting with potential applicants to understand the primary need better. After discussion, they felt it would be best to leave it available to all areas.

The CRC discussed whether funding limits for each organization should be applied and found a consensus of setting a minimum amount of \$10,000.

The CRC discussed organizational points, the weight of the score, and total points with consensus for the scoring rubric to have individual scores for each question with organizational points and total points.

Collaboration and Letters of Support were discussed, and the consensus was to add them to the application.

A timeline was discussed and tentatively set, which included a pre-application meeting.

The CRC directed staff to align the grant outline, the application, and the rubric.

October 7, 2022, Meeting

Staff presented a revision to the program outline and application based on direction from the CRC and aligned the rubric scoring with the application and program.

The CRC approved the grant outline, application, and rubric changes.

Program advertising and posting were discussed.

Final Program Developed by Coalition

Program Defined

- 1) A description of the nature of the grant program
- 2) Identifying the Schedule for Submission, Review, and Recommendations
 - a. At least six weeks for application submittal
 - b. Preapplication Conference
 - c. Submission instructions and date
 - d. Review and Scoring Period
- 3) Identifying Eligibility
- 4) Review and Selection Criteria
 - a. Community Needs
 - b. Program/Project Sustainability
 - c. Evaluation of Program
 - d. Organization and Budget
 - e. Partnerships, Coordination, and Innovation

Development of the Application and Rubric

- 1) Developed an application - All applicants must submit the same application and material.
- 2) The Application and Rubric were developed to assist applicants in answering each criterion.

Public Notice of The Request for Grant Application

- 1) Adequate public notice of the request for grant applications -CRC identified at least six weeks before the due date for the submittal of applications
- 2) Program and Applications were posted on October 10, 2022
- 3) Pre-Application Conference was held on October 21, 2022

Receipt of Grant Application

Applications were accepted from October 10 through December 9, 2022

- 1) All applications were received via email to the City Clerk's office by 5:00 PM on December 9, 2022
- 2) Applications shall be evaluated by the CRC

Application Review Coalition Score

- 1) The evaluators (CRC members) reviewed each application solely on the evaluation criteria or factors outlined in the grant applications. Evaluators sent final scores to the City Clerk's Office
- 2) Finance tallied the scores from each CRC member and provided the CRC members with the final total scores.

Discussion on Review and Scoring

The CRC's three meetings on January 12th, January 26th, and February 9th to review scores and make recommendations to Council.

January 12, 2023, Meeting

The CRCs' combined assessments scores were ranked highest to lowest.

The CRC discussed the ranking and that funding at 100% would provide for the top 7 organizations. Some concerns with organizations providing services outside of Lake Havasu City.

Discussion on that the rubric was agreed upon, how it was weighted, and that this was a solid plan for allocating funding. Straying from this scoring process could create room for questions within the community.

Discussion on whether funding at 80% would allow capital improvements to be unfinished.

Motion to fund top seven was made and failed 2 to 3.

Motion to request the top ten applicants revise their budget and provide a narrative supporting it. The motion carried 5-0

January 26, 2023, Meeting

The CRC discussed the MIKID organization with organization representatives.

Local Presents Concern: Discussion on whether they have a facility in Lake Havasu City. They rent a room at the aquatic center to conduct business, but most of their contact is not in an office setting. They currently serve 40 to 50 families in Lake Havasu City each year through direct support or parenting support.

Duplication of Services Concern: Parenting classes are Department of Child Safety (DCS) approved. DCS has funding and wants to confirm that we are not supplanting funds. Although approved by DCS, no funding goes to MIKID; classes are not limited to DCS resources; classes are for all families. Concern that these parenting classes might be a duplicate service Lake Havasu School district "Love and Logic" offers. Possible opportunity for collaboration.

Open Table Inc. discussion with organization representatives.

They were asked how their pilot programs are measuring success. With the networking, they could implement efficiencies and save money to put back into the daycare facility and staff wages.

Community Health Department Foundation discussion with CRC members, River City United Way, and CHDF organizations representative.

Duplication of services between CHDF and United Way, both projects are patient navigators to track services available for referral and services provided.

Due to similarities, the CRC chose the organization that ranked the highest and eliminated Community Health Development Foundation.

Impact-928 discussion among CRC members and organization members.

Discuss the differentiation between what federal/state foster funding provides vs. Impact 928. They cover additional costs to make homes qualify for foster homes.

Location of where funds will be spent. Although Impact 928 will provide for all of Mohave County, currently, they have only assisted Lake Havasu City and understand these funds will only be spent in Lake Havasu City.

The direction was given to MIKID to revise the budget a 2nd time only to include Lake Havasu City. And request that the next four organizations submit a revised budget at 80%

The CRC recommended 5-0 to fund the following organizations at their revised budget amounts Faith and Grace, Inc., The Clothes Closet, Inc., River Cities United Way, H.A.V.E.N. Family Resource Center, Inc., Open Table, Inc., Covenant Church Lake Havasu, Grace Episcopal Church, and Women With Willpower.

February 9, 2023, Meeting

The CRC reviewed the MIKID budget. The organization representative discussed that the parenting classes offered were offered for all ages of children, whereas the school program would only be for school age. In addition, the classes provided by MIKID had statistical success and recommendations. They do believe they have duplicated efforts, and they gave a guarantee that funds will only be spent in Lake Havasu City.

Impact 928 – 80% budget was reviewed.

Discussion on how the remaining dollars would be distributed ensued. Whether this should fund the next ranked organization or be split between the next three ranked.

The CRC recommended 4-1 to fund the following organizations in their revised budget: MIKID Mentally Ill Kids in Distress, Impact 928, Inc., and Child & Family Resources, Inc.

The Outcome of Discussion to Recommendation Summary

The top 14 organizations were requested to revise their budget to 80%.

- 1) Discussion to recommend the top 7 to Council – Top Concerns
 - a. Duplication of services wasn't reviewed with individual scoring
 - b. Only seven organizations would benefit from the funding
 - c. If funding is cut, could organizations complete their project or program
- 2) A review and discussion on program or project duplication were discussed.
 - a. One applicant Community Health Development Foundation (which scored 10th), was eliminated due to duplication.
- 3) Discussion on and with organizations that have services outside Lake Havasu City
 - a. CRC requested MIKID to resubmit a third time addressing possible duplication with schools and funding only to assist Lake Havasu City residents with ARPA funds.
 - b. Impact 928 – The program will expand out of Lake Havasu City. They currently only assist those within Lake Havasu, and ARPA dollars will only be used within Lake Havasu City.

Recommendation to Council

- 1) The CRC made award recommendations to the Council.
 - a. The CRCs' recommendations included the revised budgets of the applicants.
 - b. The recommendation includes funding the top 11 ranked applicants (excluding applicant 10 for duplication) at the revised budget level submitted. And to provide remaining dollars up to \$1,000,000 to the 12th ranked applicant.