

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA**



Agenda Date:	August 1, 2011
Action Required:	Approval
Presenter:	Gretchen Ellis, Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Children and Families
Staff Contacts:	Leslie Beauregard, Ryan Davidson, Mike Murphy
Title:	Funding Priorities for Nonprofit Programs – Update to Council from July 5, 2011 Council Meeting

Background:

The Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Children and Families (CCF) (and its predecessor the Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Youth) has managed the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process for funding of human service non-profits for the City and County since the early 1980s. In July, 2010, the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT), in consultation with the City Manager's and County Executive's Offices, recommended that the localities undertake a comprehensive review of how funding to community agencies is determined. This review was to provide the framework that would allow the localities to establish a process for determining priorities for local government funding, enabling the localities to maximize results, especially during difficult financial times. CCF convened a Steering Committee, which conducted a number of activities and completed broad-based research over a nine-month period. In the absence of a current needs assessment, the Steering Committee established seven goals for a vibrant healthy community and then used available data to identify three of these as highest priorities. The full recommendations of the Steering Committee and staff were presented to City Council on July 5, 2011. Council generally appeared to approve of the recommendation, but asked staff to return with more information which is outlined below:

Discussion and recommendations following July 6th Council meeting and feedback from Council:

1. The Steering Committee recommended that the localities conduct a comprehensive needs assessment every four years. Because the recommendations were for both City Council and the Albemarle Board of Supervisors, staff for the two localities developed common recommendations and did not endorse this recommendation because of anticipated cost. Council endorsed moving forward with a needs assessment regardless of County participation. On July 6, 2011, the recommendations were presented to the Board of Supervisors, who voted to accept staff recommendation. However, the Board expressed an interest in being provided more information about the content and cost of a needs assessment and suggested contacting other funding bodies such as the United Way to gauge their interest.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that they prepare a proposal for a needs assessment including cost estimates to present to City Council and the Board of

Supervisors by October 1, 2011. The proposal will include mechanisms to elicit and incorporate feedback from stakeholders/beneficiaries (see #3 below).

2. Council indicated an interest in establishing their own annual priorities for use of their Council Discretionary Funds.
Recommendation: Staff recommends that if Council wants to proceed, they should identify priorities they would like to support and desired outcomes on yearly basis, perhaps at their annual retreat. Staff would then issue a Request for Proposals, similar to the ABRT application. It would be reviewed by a Subcommittee of the ABRT using the same criteria as the non-contractual funding process. Staff recommends that these funds be time-limited, perhaps for two years, with the second year contingent on performance and availability of sufficient funds.
3. Council requested that staff provide recommendations about how to solicit feedback from stakeholder/beneficiaries.
Recommendations:
 - a. **Staff recommends including a mechanism to solicit feedback in the needs assessment described in discussion item #1 above.**
 - b. **The proposed funding application requires programs to demonstrate how they solicit feedback and how they involve participants/beneficiaries in the planning and governance of the programs.**
4. Council indicated that they would like to have an outside organization evaluate programs. Staff needs additional guidance as to which organizations should be evaluated and how funds for such an evaluation would be secured.
5. Council asked staff to look for other communities that have successfully addressed poverty. Nashville was mentioned as a locality to investigate further. CCF will seek student volunteer help to conduct this research, but realistically this research cannot start before early 2012 to be completed by July 2012.
6. Council indicated that they would like to see increased data sharing and tracking. CCF recently commissioned and received a report on possible technology to accomplish this. Creating and implementing a comprehensive data sharing network is a complex, long-term task, which requires careful planning. The Partnership for Children, CCF's early childhood workgroup and the Smart Beginnings Initiative are working jointly to plan for a pilot information sharing project for the publicly funded pre-school, the home visiting collaborative, and the public schools. CCF is also working with the UVA Department of Public Health Sciences and the Center for Non-Profit Excellence to develop a platform for reporting the indicators of community well-being identified in the Funding Priorities report.
7. Council asked for clarification of the recommendation that Arts and Cultural programs and Festivals be included in the ABRT process. The four representatives of these programs on the Steering Committee argued persuasively that they be included in the process because they believed they should be perceived as equivalent programs to other non-profits. These programs would be reviewed by a sub-committee of the ABRT, composed of members with expertise in arts, culture and tourism. **Staff continues to endorse this recommendation.**
8. Council requested copies of the proposed application and evaluation criteria which are attached.

9. The Albemarle County Board of Supervisors made two requests of staff when they reviewed the recommendations. They asked that IMPACT be notified when the application is released. They also asked for information about other communities funding of non-profits. A copy of the memo to the County Executive's office is attached. Making an "apples-to-apples" comparison proved to be more difficult than originally envisioned so please read the bulleted list of qualifying statements included in the analysis to put the data in full perspective.

Budgetary Impact:

In FY 11 and FY12, City Council approved approximately \$2,500,000 to nonprofits, excluding those with contractual or statutory funding. It is expected that the following recommendations made in the report will not have an impact on this funding amount unless Council decides to incorporate all or part of its Council Priority Initiatives funds.

Recommendations:

Staff recommends that City Council approve Recommendations 1-6 of the original Prioritization Report.

Alternatives:

The City could continue with the review processes conducted by the ABRT and OMB prior to the FY12 funding cycle.

Attachments:

Draft application forms, draft evaluation matrix, memorandum to the Board of Supervisors.