Survey Results of Committee Member Satisfaction Survey of Summer Process: Sept 2012

Community Services Committee   **3 Responses**

1. Rate	Level of Satisfaction (5 = very satisfied)

a. Clarity of Goal and Objectives, funding priorities and criteria

Level of Importance (5 = high)		1	2	3	4	5
	5	A			C	
	4					
	3		B			
	2					
	1					

b. Guidance from Mayor

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4					
3		C	B		
2					
1	A				

c. Data about community needs and trends

	1	2	3	4	5
5	A C				
4		B			
3					
2					
1					

d. Utility of materials

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4		B		C	
3					
2			A		
1					

e. Accuracy of reviews

	1	2	3	4	5
5			A		C
4				B	
3					
2					
1					

f. Helpfullness of application

	1	2	3	4	5
5			C		
4				A B	
3					
2					
1					

g. Sufficient time to read apps

	1	2	3	4	5
5		C			
4				B	
3					A
2					
1					

h. Opportunity to hear presentations

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4				B	A
3			C		
2					
1					

i. Responsiveness of Staff

	1	2	3	4	5
5				C	B
4					
3					A
2					
1					

j. Utility of staff recommendations

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4	A			B C	
3					
2					
1					

k. Adequacy of time for discussion

	1	2	3	4	5
5	C				
4					
3				A	
2					
1					

l. Openness and transparency of process

	1	2	3	4	5
5	A				C
4				B	
3					
2					
1					

2. If you rated some items high for importance and low for satisfaction, please explain.

● a. The goals and objectives seem based on history and inerti,a and a desire to not rock the boat rather than any reflection of priorites in the community or from the Mayor/Council, or a reflection of evidence of community need. I don't understand why the amount of funding in each category is set, nor do I understand what that set level is based on (other than history).

● c. It seems like we've all agreed that it's hard to get data about needs and so we don't even try. Surely our funded agencies could provide some (if only anecdotal) info. Surely we could ask the United Way, School District, Workforce Dev Board, Community Foundation, etc for any info they might have. This info should influence the process of setting goals and objectives.

● e/j. I'm not sure why you ask about the accuracy of the staff reviews. I'm not concerned with them being accurate, but I also think they are halfway between summaries and reviews. I don't need staff to summarize the application for me – I can read it myself. In fact, I don't want to read a staff summary in case it shapes my view or the application (the summaries should be after the application, not before). What I want from staff is information not contained in the application – how is this agencies track record? Have there been problems? Have they been addressed? What does staff think about the application and why? Also, if staff is going to make recommendations about funding, I want to know in detail what those are based on.

● l. This process seems, despite all the open meetings and records, to be completely non-transparent, because there's no way to tell what the staff recommendations are based on or what the committee will do. The goals and objectives don't seem to mean anything in terms of what's funded or not. It's not clear how the information in the applications influences the levels of funding. What we did this time (the formulas, more/better information from staff) was a start, but it really needs to be predictable all the way through. If we set goals, they need to mean something. If we ask for information in the application, it should influence the funding decisions.

● there is a dearth of community based needs data. One month is not sufficient time for app review

3. Satisfaction w/ overall process

Not Satisfied   Very Satisfied

1	2	3	4	5
A		B C		

4. Other issues?

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4					
3					
2					
1					

5. Rank usefulness	A	B	C	Average
Funding History	8	9	6	7.7
Application	10	2	10	7.3
Staff summary	1	10	9	6.7
Staff informal discussion at meetings	7	6	7	6.7
Agency written responses	5	4	8	5.7
Agency verbal presentation	4	5	2	3.7
Rankings by Committee members	1	3	5	3.0
Other Committee members' discussion	6	8	4	6.0
Info provided by applicants to individual Committee members	1	1	3	1.7
Public hearing	2	7	1	3.3

6. What is the best feature of the application?
- That we ask about quantifying need
- the agency's "request" portion based on methods for evaluation
- It covered every possible topic area

7. If you could improve one thing about the application, what would it be?
- Make the questions more distinct, it seems there was a fair amount of overlap in the answers in any one app

- there were pages that were blank; ie 4 committee members, but 12-15 spaces still printed. Very paper intensive & hard to get back to staff in batches.
- Incorporate past performance information. Eg, regular reports, staff involvement, etc.

8. If you could improve one thing about the staff's presentation of materials, what would it be?
- I would like a brief review of the agency's performance and ability to carry out the proposed programs. I don't want staff to decide that an agency should be doing something completely different without discussing that with the agency and then try and get us to go along with that in how we fund them.
- Make sure that particularly salient comments, in other words, red flags, are highlighted

9. What is the best feature of the overall decision-making process?
- The amount of time and attention committee members give to each application
- this survey-hearing agencies' comments about process to use for improvements
- The app and decision-making process triest ot cover the widest range of issues

10. If you could improve one thing about the overall process, what would it be?
- I would completely revamp it to be transparent and consistent, from goals to final funding decisions. Agencies should know before they write their application what they will be scored on. We should announce up front that the total funding available will likely be 5% less than the previous year's funding. We should make it more clear what our approach to new proposals is – i.e. what it would take for a new proposal to be funded. This process should be consistent throughout the four OCS committees (early childhood, senior, CSC and conference).

- only allow max of 2 speakers/agency or 2/program
- Cull the application

11. Please check the answer that most closely matches your opinion of the process this time.

First time   ● 2 responses

This summer was better

This summer was about the same   ● It was still an extraordinary effort to review the apps but restricting the length of time, made it seem more managable.

This summer was worse

12. How many times have you participated in summer process?

1-2	3-5	6+
	X X	

13. Which Committee?

COA	CSC	CDBG	ECCEC
	X		

14. Additional Comments

● I understand the disclosure rule, but felt my time preparing was much greater than my ability to participate

● Staff didn't "cut corners" during an intensive process and followed thru with our requests for additional info

● I believe that some basic, fundamental changes are needed. I'd like to suggest one meeting at least devoted to brainstorming for new approaches, or maybe a subcommittee across all 4 committees