

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AGENDA TITLE: Funding Priorities/Process for Nonprofit Agencies	AGENDA DATE: July 6, 2011
SUBJECT/PROPOSAL/REQUEST: Commission on Children and Families Steering Committee Recommendations	ACTION: X INFORMATION:
STAFF CONTACT(S): Messrs. Foley, Elliott, Davis and White; and Ms. Allshouse	CONSENT AGENDA: ACTION: INFORMATION:
LEGAL REVIEW: Yes	ATTACHMENTS: Yes
	REVIEWED BY:

BACKGROUND:

The Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Children and Families (CCF), and its predecessor, the Charlottesville/Albemarle Commission on Youth, have managed the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) process for funding human service non-profit agencies for the County and the City since the early 1980s. Over the years, the process has evolved, most significantly with the move to an outcome measurement-based application in 2001 and the introduction of an objective point-based evaluation rubric in 2004.

In July, 2010, the ABRT, in consultation with the Offices of the County Executive and the City Manager, recommended that the localities undertake a comprehensive review of how funding to community agencies is determined. The purpose of this review was to assist the localities in establishing a process for determining priorities for local government funding, enabling the localities to maximize results, especially during difficult financial times. CCF was tasked with creating a Steering Committee and to develop priorities, as well as a process for funding priority community agencies in the FY13 budget. The Steering Committee was asked to consider organizations previously reviewed by the ABRT, as well as those reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The recommendations from the Steering Committee are attached in the Final Report (Attachment A), along with a list of currently-funded agencies (Appendix 10 of the Report).

DISCUSSION:

CCF created 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, then utilized available data to identify three of these as highest priorities. The full recommendations of the Steering Committee are summarized below and provided in detail in the attached Report and include:

1. City Council and Board of Supervisors conduct a comprehensive needs assessment every four years.
2. Board of Supervisors to endorse the following goals as highest priority for funding and that applications successfully addressing these goals be given additional weight:
 - Community residents are physically and mentally healthy.
 - Community residents are safe and have basic needs met.
 - Children in the community develop appropriately and succeed academically.Additional goals were identified as important and should be considered for funding:
 - The community provides a vibrant economic climate.
 - The community manages natural resources to sustain current and future generations.
 - The community uses arts, culture and recreation.
 - The community is inclusive and engaged.
3. The Steering Committee has identified indicators that reflect accomplishment of the goals and recommends that programs be evaluated, in part, on their ability to promote attainment of the goals.
4. Funding to be prioritized on successfully addressing the goals outlined in Recommendation 2 above, using the following criteria:
 - a. Demonstration of need and programming that effectively addresses need.
 - b. Evaluation of program outcomes showing program effectiveness.

AGENDA TITLE: Funding Priorities/Process for Nonprofit Agencies

July 6, 2011

Page 2

- c. Demonstration of financial benefit to the localities and/or program participants.
- d. Outreach to and engagement of underserved populations.
5. The funding process be modified as follows: *NOTE: The Steering Committee recommended the use of “non-contractual” rather than “discretionary” to define agency funding that is not mandatory or required by contract. Beginning with FY12 funding, all funded agencies will enter into a contract/agreement for both City and County funding. A list of agencies proposed for the ABRT process can be found in Appendix 10 of the Report.*
 - a. Non-contractual funding for non-profit programs should be consolidated into one process with review by the ABRT or a subcommittee.
 - b. Arts and Cultural Programs and Festivals should be included in the ABRT process, and reviewed by a subcommittee with relevant expertise.
 - c. All programs being considered for non-contractual funding should complete the same application and be considered under the same criteria.
 - d. Contractual or statutory funding should continue to be managed by the Offices of Management and Budget.
6. The Steering Committee recommends that:
 - a. Applications are considered on their merits on an annual basis, using an objective scoring system that rates them as Poor, Fair, Solid, or Exemplary. Programs rated Poor should be defunded. Programs rated Fair should receive at least a 25% cut in funding and be required to submit quarterly progress reports, with a second rating of Fair resulting in defunding.
 - b. ABRT make funding recommendations for programs rated Solid and Exemplary based on community need, effectiveness and program characteristics with existing programs rated Solid or Exemplary receiving not more than a 10% cut in funding or a 20% increase in funding per year.
 - c. Funding for previously unfunded programs that demonstrate that they meet community needs effectively be considered for funding if they receive a rating of “Solid” or better on their application.

BUDGET IMPACT:

For FY12, the Board of Supervisors approved approximately \$2 million of discretionary funding for the agencies listed in the Attachment. The recommendations for revising the application process are not intended to impact the total amount of discretionary funding available.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors accept the Steering Committee report and endorse in principle Recommendations 2-6 listed above. Staff does not recommend endorsing Recommendation 1 due to the lack of financial resources available to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. Staff recommends that the Board encourage CCF to use existing studies/reports such as Stepping Stones and collaborate with the United Way to identify needs and service delivery gaps for the priority goals.

Staff further recommends that in order to implement Recommendations 5 & 6, the following process be utilized and completed by December of each year:

- CCF convenes the Agency Budget Review Team (ABRT) as three or four subgroups to review and score applications with each team responsible for approximately fifteen to twenty programs. Scoring will be completed using a matrix created by CCF (September – October).
- The respective staff from the City and County Budget Offices will review and rate all applications while the ABRT teams are in review of the applications (September – October).
- Following ABRT review, the City and County Budget Office staff will meet with the ABRT to determine a final rating (November).
- Scoring and ranking from all teams will be returned to CCF at which point the City and County respective Budget Office and CCF staff will apply recommended award amounts (December).

ATTACHMENTS

[A – Steering Committee Final Report](#)

[Return to agenda](#)