

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

COA=Black

CSC=Green

CDBG=Red

ECCEC=Blue

## 1. Rate

Level of Satisfaction (5 = very satisfied)		1	2	3	4	5
Level of Importance (5 = high)	5	A			E A B C	B C D D
	4				A C	
	3		B	A		
	2					
	1					

### a. Guidance from Mayor

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

### c. Data about community needs and trends

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

### d. Utility of materials

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

### e. Accuracy of reviews

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

### f. Helpfulness of application

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

g. Sufficient time to read apps

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

h. Opportunity to hear presentations

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

i. Responsiveness of Staff

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

j. Utility of staff recommendations

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

k. Adequacy of time for discussion

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

l. Openness and transparency of process

	1	2	3	4	5
5	A			D A	A B C C B C D
4				E B	A
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 inertia and a desire to not rock the boat rather than any reflection of priorities 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
- time constraints (length of meeting constrained) yet we couldn't meet together other times.

**3. Satisfaction w/ overall process**

Not Satisfied			Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5
A		E B C	A C A B	B D C D

**4. Other issues?**  
*Our questions for the agencies could have been reviewed and combined (in committee) and saved time/repetitions*

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4					
3			E		
2					
1					

**5. Rank usefulness**

	<u>COA Average</u>	<u>CDBG Average</u>	<u>CSC Average</u>	<u>ECCEC</u>
<i>Funding History</i>	7	6.5	7.7	Didn't Answer
<i>Application</i>	7.2	7.5	7.3	
<i>Staff summary</i>	7.2	9.5	6.7	
<i>Staff informal discussion at meetings</i>	5.6	6.25	6.7	
<i>Agency written responses</i>	5.6	5	5.7	
<i>Agency verbal presentation</i>	6.2	6	3.7	
<i>Rankings by Committee members</i>	4.75	2.75	3.0	
<i>Other Committee members' discussion</i>	5.75	8.25	6.0	
<i>Info provided by applicants to individual Committee members</i>	4	1	1.7	
<i>Public hearing</i>	6.25	3	3.3	

## 6. What is the best feature of the application?

- reasonably simple to follow
- asking what the intended accomplishment is-is the goal realistic and measurable and likely to be achieved.
- service description
- it gives the agency the opportunity to fully explain their mission and goals
- First Page
- Comprehensive nature of process; justification
- The needs section-however, most agencies do not take time to update info. Copying and pasting from year to year dilutes the potential for this section to offer the committee a diverse opinion regarding our communities needs as they relate to CDD framework
- The goals and objectives offer the most simple, direct basis for comparison among apps. This section is most useful in determining how a program connects to the Framework as well as how it uses allocated resources.
- That we ask about quantifying need
- the agency's "request" portion based on methods for evaluation
- It covered every possible topic area
- Electronic version availability

## 7. If you could improve one thing about the application, what would it be?

- ask if funding request is for services currently being provided by another agency, clearly outline why your services are different and why you are requesting funding
- for some agencies, more complete discussion of "program outcomes"
- Shorten it
- more focus on project, less on general info
- Applicants rarely respond to the question about indirect costs with confidence or accuracy. Even after staff have offered clear, concise definitions of "indirect cost allocation" to applicants, the narratives fail to include useful info. I recommend replacing this question with a request for response to their most recent audit or SAS115 Letter, if relevant. Maybe we could ask, "Were any deficiencies noted related to your Cost Allocation Program, in the Management Letter or SAS 115 letter, from your auditors? If so, please list the comments, and your responses."
- 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
- 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?

- staff presentation was excellent as were the materials provided
- Clearer, more detailed "performance history"
- Staff should feel free to be more blunt w/ their recommendations
- CDD staff does an amazing job of making all materials easy to read, review and respond to. To wit, this is the 3rd survey I have completed this month relating to grant review/application process and it is the only one that will yield useful results. I can offer no suggestions for improvement.
- 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?

- written materials submitted by agencies regarding goals, accomplishments and obstacles
- Close to agreement on the best apps
- the opportunity to review and compare all the funding requests to avoid funding of duplicate services. This was time consuming but a very important part of the decision making.
- We were provided detailed information
- great work the staff does to inform & update the committee

- the Committee discussion
- comprehensive approach, balancing of factors, Conference Committee
- the two best features are discussion among committee members and agency presentation
- 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 tried to cover the widest range of issues
- Opportunity to "hear" and see agencies

**10. If you could improve one thing about the overall process, what would it be?**

- prior to engaging in process make sure committee members are familiar with services provided by each agency w/ respect to the priorities
- Divide the apps among the Committee members so that more time could be given to each application, and every committee member would not have to review all apps
- listen to agency verbal presentations before completing the rating sheet.
- more discussion in committee (prior)
- it's very time consuming, but I don't have any suggestions for simplifying or shortening it. (2)
- Reduce administrative burden on staff and agencies
- Place greater emphasis on the concept of Purchase of Service: that as City volunteers we are helping the City choose what services to provide to residents and what the City will contribute towards paying for these services. These services have been outlined and specified in the Framework. We know that the City of Madison is not going to hire staff to perform all the duties required to meet our goals, so we grant money to local service providers. Grants are not charity. We pay agencies to provide services. Hopefully, this would minimize the impact of individual's feelings on the process. I hear a lot of "I feel bad" especially during joint meetings of CDBG and OCS. A simple reminder that we are making business choices, not engaging in charity, could facilitate committee members making rational decisions.
- 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
- Not having 5% cut announced 2 day before we started
- Not having the School Age Community Centers in was a "help" in amt to read

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

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <i>First time</i>                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 4 responses</li> <li>● 1 response</li> <li>● 2 responses</li> </ul>  |
| <i>This summer was better</i>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● I was more familiar w/ the agencies, their programs and the process</li> <li>● easier without neighborhood centers</li> <li>● Conference Committee and Joint meetings of CDBG and OCS have dramatically improved the process. Collaboration would be enhanced if both committees had the equivalent of the CDBG Framework, used similar language to describe funding sources, goals and objectives, and if we attended one another's agency presentation/question and answer sessions.</li> <li>● Clear dates, binder, issues</li> </ul> |
| <i>This summer was about the same</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It was still an extraordinary effort to review the apps but restricting the length of time, made it seem more manageable.</li> </ul>   |
| <i>This summer was worse</i>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● most committee members were not familiar with the programs and requested info from agencies that could have easily have been answered in a committee meeting by staff.</li> </ul>  |

12. How many times have you participated in summer process?	1-2	3-5	6+
	B C	B D A B C	

13. Which Committee?	COA	CSC	CDBG	ECCEC
	X	X	X	X

#### 14. Additional Comments

- I was concerned about the extensive process that resulted in only funding previously funded programs. There should be at least a small amt earmarked for new projects
- Keep the Conference Committee set up; good way to coordinate when consolidation takes place
- Teach me how to do survey onl line/electronically. No "system" worked this year
- 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

# Survey Results of Staff Satisfaction Survey of Summer Process: Sept 2012

COA=Black  
CDBG=Red

CSC=Green  
ECCEC=Blue

1. Rate		Level of Satisfaction (5 = very satisfied)				
		1	2	3	4	5
a. Clarity of Goal and Objectives, funding priorities and criteria	Level of Importance (5 = high)	5	C	F	EA	ACA
		4			BB	DAB
		3		D		
		2				
		1				

		1	2	3	4	5
b. Guidance from Mayor	5		C	F		
	4		EBD	BCDA	A	
	3			AA		
	2			B		
	1					

		1	2	3	4	5
c. Data about community needs and trends	5	CAA	BC	A	A	
	4	D	DEFB			
	3					
	2			B		
	1					

		1	2	3	4	5
d. Utility of materials regarding calendar, steps, agenda, etc	5	F	DEB	B	AAD	CA
	4			B	A	
	3					
	2					
	1					

		1	2	3	4	5
e. Utility of binders, funding histories	5			C	F	
	4			D	ADA	
	3		A	BCEA	B	
	2			B		
	1					

		1	2	3	4	5
f. Helpfulness of app	5	C	AB	FC	ED	AB
	4		D		A	
	3			B		
	2					
	1					

g. Sufficient time to read apps

	1	2	3	4	5
5		CD	BCA	AE	
4			FABA		
3			D		
2			B		
1					

h. Opportunity to hear agency presentations

	1	2	3	4	5
5			FC		
4		AD	BA	C	
3		D	AB	B	
2		EA			
1					

i. Use of staff recommendations

	1	2	3	4	5
5	CD		B	F	E
4		A	DA	ACA	B
3		B			
2					
1					

j. Adequacy of time for Committee discussion

	1	2	3	4	5
5	A	BCD		ABCF	E
4		D	A	AB	
3					
2					
1					

k. Openness and transparency of process

	1	2	3	4	5
5		C	CF	AEA	ABD
4			D	BAB	
3					
2					
1					

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

A-more demographic info needed

A-Application asks for info I don't need and doesn't ask for needed info

C-Goals, objectives, & conditions were ok (some conditions, not clear). Funding priorities & criteria (not conditions) were not always clear. We need more data to set priorities & someone to analyze.

E-Items listed as higher importance are items I feel can hinder the funding process if not addressed when organizing process

D-Calendar was confusing due to constant changes

A-process and funding priorities overly broad.

A- Info and data about community needs and trends not available in all funded areas. (2)

D-Committee dismissed staff recommendations, and I think it is a mistake on the committee's part.



**3. Satisfaction w/ overall process**

Not Satisfied			Very Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5
	D	A B F B A C D	E A	A

**4. Other issues?**  
A-Full staff participation in complete process

	1	2	3	4	5
5	A				
4					
3					
2					
1					

**4. Other issues?**  
C-sufficient time to write staff reviews and revise

	1	2	3	4	5
5	A				
4					
3					
2					
1					

**4. Other issues?**  
D-Organization

	1	2	3	4	5
5					D
4					
3					
2					
1					

**4. Other issues?**  
D-Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5
5	F				D
4					
3					
2					
1					

**4. Other issues?**  
D-Time (not for PJ or GA)

	1	2	3	4	5
5					
4					
3				D	
2					
1					

<b>5. Rank usefulness</b>	<b>COA</b>	<b>CDBG Average</b>	<b>CSC Average</b>	<b>ECCEC Average</b>
<i>Funding History</i>		3.8	3.25	5.5
<i>Application</i>	6	9.7	10	5.5
<i>Staff summary</i>	9	7.7	9	7.0
<i>Staff informal discussion at meetings</i>	10	7.0	7.25	5.0
<i>Agency written responses</i>	7	6.0	6.5	4.0
<i>Agency verbal presentation</i>		5.0	4.75	7.0
<i>Rankings by Committee members</i>		7.7	5.25	3.0
<i>Committee members' discussion</i>	8	7.7	5	6.5
<i>Info provided by applicants to individual Committee members</i>		4.0	2.5	7.0
<i>Public hearing</i>	5	3.0	1.5	4.5

#### **6. What is the best feature of the application?**

- Electronic Format (3 responses)
- Agency budget tied to program budget
- Spreadsheets!! (unlike Reserve Fund App)
- Description of project & need of funds boxes
- very thorough description of program model/design is possible
- Autofill & error message w/ budget pages
- Goals and Objectives
- Electronic Format
- The background given on each agency for those who are going through the process for the first time.
- That it was available electronically

#### **7. If you could improve one thing about the application, what would it be?**

- Excel is a clunky way of providing text, switch to other format
- Revise the measurable objectives question (or delete if unable to design a question agencies can answer in a meaningful manner)
- Adding name of agency and program to each page as a footer and auto numbering pages
- budget pages get messed up and they have to submit edits. Better instructions about budgets?
- make it shorter-more concise
- Simplify budget pages/info
- more detail and space allotted to program description
- Put it on Provider Gateway
- Simplify it
- Listing the areas/communities within the City the program will serve.
- Having Provider Gateway up and running well before the funding process

#### **8. If you could improve one thing about the staff's presentation of materials, what would it be?**

- Greater consistency or clearer expectation about what staff should address
- too many 3-5 part questions results in key question not being answered. (1 question per box)
- Information needs to be received in a timely manner
- Agreement with committee prior to start of process regarding how they want info, particularly related to the slate presented

- Program Area staff should do a verbal intro to each area and point out outstanding or unique issues w/ regard to individual applications
- Focus more on reports and performance for new apps, speak to the issue & history of why it needs to be funded
- Staff should be presenting info on the programs funded all during the year, so committee is familiar with the programs and how they are running
- summary report of meeting outcome goals for each agency would be helpful for committee discussions.
- Provider Gateway info again. It is difficult to present correct and up-to-date info when we don't know if the program will or will not be utilized.

#### 9. What is the best feature of the overall decision-making process?

- transparency and open decision-making
- It is open to the public during committee's decision making
- Presentations and Q&A by CDBG Committee of agency staff
- Staff reviews & discussions w/ committee members (2)
- It's over
- staff/committee interaction and openness of meetings (ie transparency)
- the "objective" way Alder Satya came up with as a process
- committee members are serious about making good decisions
- Finding out what different people see as priorities based on their personal experiences and goals for the community
- The Committee ranking sheets were helpful and gave quantitative data to assist in decision making.

#### 10. If you could improve one thing about the overall process, what would it be?

- less demands on citizen committees
- Fewer night meetings. Have management part of staff discussions so no surprises later on.
- Better explanation of how Conference Committee will operate and make decisions
- Staff reviews are too labor intensive
- More organization and direction from one person. There seems to be too many people giving direction and not always the same info was given out. When there was a go-to person, that person seemed to be out and there wasn't back up for staff or agencies to go to.
- Limit presentation to 4 speakers max at 5 minutes each
- Better leadership
- focus priorities or process
- more time for staff reviews and fewer proposals to committee-spread program areas over different years
- as staff we need to be more helpful to the committee
- Too much is crammed into too little time. More time is needed in application turn-around, staff review and Committee review
- Staff give more direction and options for how the committee has made decisions in the past, to help them get started, and jump in with guidance when discussion or decision making stalls.
- Meeting with staff from all the areas to hear about the programs being funded and why their committees allotted the funds they did. This would also be an opportunity to see where gaps in funding for key areas of the City are
- find out if Committees want or will use staff recommendations. No need to spend time and energy on items that committees do not use.

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

First time

*This summer was better*

C A

- No late hour attempts to finish the process with a list of "winners"
- agencies had to spend less time in meetings, process less convoluted as we were not reorganizing program areas
- This process was better organized than others.
- Better than last time, but about the same as years past
- Both summer processes I have been through have had equal good and bad features. Some improvements made at last process removed, but some things improved upon

*This summer was about the same*

- some things were better (staff reviews), others were worse (too rushed)
- While staff may have been more reliable, the Provider Gateway system was not. It was nice to be able to have the summer process without neighborhood centers for deadlines, etc.

*This summer was worse*

- CDBG staff were not involved in process, discouraged to participate
- Disorganized, left hand not knowing what right hand was doing
- Lack of leadership
- less prep time was allowed/spent regarding needs assessment, goals & priorities etc.
- I felt Committee did not get much help from staff to help them make decisions

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

1-2	3-5	6+
E A	D F B A D	A B B

**13. Which Committee?**

COA	CSC	CDBG	ECCEC
X	X	X	X

**14. Additional Comments**

- Can we improve the app to provide better info for CDBG projects? The app seemed weighted towards social services (eg-what are hours of operation?) and less toward development capacity and dev. Project need.
- Information sent out to the public, CDBG Committee, Agencies, etc must be accurate & look nice. Need time built in for Final Review for proofreading by "Communications Specialist" or someone in that role.
- The app needs to include more relevant questions for housing development, especially rental development. The app needs to exclude some irrelevant questions
- Workload seemed too heavy for some staff with 8-15 apps. Apps could be partially numerically scored and partially staff reviews
- For the amt of experience or the staff members running the show, and only four new staff, this should have been less stressful. There seemed to be a power struggle of who was doing what, who was in charge, and which forms and processes to use. There could have been a happy medium.
- Do this survey on surveymonkey in the future
- we need leadership and clearer direction
- Would like to explore the idea of simplified applications for continuing programs and/or rotating focus on program areas

- I think the committee should be working toward the funding process at each meeting whether they are getting info on programs, deciding on processes, hearing from agencies, etc.
- There is a significant amount of staff time and money put into this process. Staff made decisions on dollar amounts and the committee didn't want to see it until after they had made their own funding choices. This left our work and funding decisions rendered useless. After the hearings on both occasions no changes were made to funding. If this is typical, some of the steps (staff funding decisions, hearings) should be eliminated. Maybe staff should just review/ summarize the applications and present to the committees and then have one hearing that select staff attend.