



9

DEPARTMENT OF  
FINANCE

BUDGET DIVISION

CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
CALIFORNIA

CITY HALL  
ROOM 14  
915 I STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA  
95814-2696

916-449-5845

July 27, 1990

Budget and Finance Committee  
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: REPORT BACK ON GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE GRANTS

SUMMARY

During the 1990-91 Budget Hearings several community groups submitted requests for funding to the City Council. Due to the unusually high number of requests, Council directed staff to develop a process to evaluate and compare the merits of each request. A total of \$150,000 was set aside to fund some of the requests in the 1990-91 fiscal year.

This report outlines a proposed evaluation process, and criteria that could be used to rank the community group. Staff will meet with interested Council members during the next two weeks to receive input on the criteria. Then staff will proceed to request additional information from those community groups that requested funding during the budget hearings. The proposals will then be evaluated against the criteria outlined in this report by a four member panel. The results of the evaluation will be returned to Council in September. At that time the decision as to which groups will receive funding can be made by the City Council.

**BACKGROUND**

Every year the City council receives requests for funding from various community groups for a wide variety of programs and services. During the 1990-91 Budget hearings a total of 34 groups requested \$ 2,490,118. The City Manager's Proposed Budget included funding of \$972,400 for groups that have been traditionally supported by the City. This left an amount of \$1,517,718 that was not included in the budget proposal submitted to the City Council.

During the budget hearings on the proposed budget the Budget and Finance Committee provided staff with direction on how to approach the unfunded community group requests. Attachment 1 provides a summary of this approach. This attachment was provided to Council during the final wrap up hearings on the proposed budget. There are 12 requests totalling \$260,035 that were recommended for funding through Community Service Grants.

The groups that were referred to the a Community Services Grant process are as follows:

Community Group	Funding in FY 91 Adopted Budget	Additional Funding Requested
Area 4 Aging Ombudsman	\$34,000	\$18,500
Community Services Planning Council	15,000	25,000
Homeless Task Force	0	50,000
Hunger Commission	0	18,250
Operation Cornerstone	0	25,000
Police Athletic League	0	50,000
Sac. School District Cultural Exchange	7,500	7,500
Sacramento Mediation Center	30,000	10,000
Sacramento Tomorrow Coalition	0	10,000
Salvation Army	0	2,335
SOCA- Photo Inventory	0	20,000
Trees for Tomorrow	0	23,450
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$86,500</b>	<b>\$260,035</b>

**Proposed Evaluation Process**

There are three basic steps to process the requests identified

above. First, each of the groups will have to submit an application that provides the City with a basic level of information on the group, and the proposal (currently the detail on the requests range from two paragraphs to several pages). Second, the City will evaluate each proposal based on a standard set of criteria. And third, the rankings will be provided to City Council so that final funding decisions can be determined.

Establishing the evaluation criteria is necessary before the process can be initiated since this will determine the type of information that is collected from the community groups. Below is a table that outlines criteria used in two grant programs. The first set is from United Way's Venture Grant Program, and the second set is from the City of Los Angeles Human Services and Neighborhood Development Division. The third set of criteria that is provided represents a suggested scale for the City's evaluation process.

The above criteria will allow staff to evaluate proposals with dissimilar objectives, and provide the City Council with a relative ranking. The end result (proposal ranking) will be used by Council to assist in the final funding decisions. An important factor that will not be measured in this analysis is the Council priority for a particular service or program. Therefore it is possible that a group that scores high on the proposed ranking scheme may not receive funding.

Once this Committee provides input on the criteria, staff will proceed to assemble an application for the community groups to complete (in order for the City to receive standard information from each group). It is anticipated that this application will be sent to the various groups in late August and that staff will return to Committee with proposal rankings in September.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Point Scales between Grant Programs

CRITERIA	POINT SCALE		
	United Way	Los Angeles	C i t y - Proposed
1. Track Record of Applicant	10	35	10
2. Quality of Needs Assessment for proposed services	10	8	15
3. Quality of program objectives	10	8	10
4. Effectiveness of Program -Scope of Program -Number of people served	10	6	15
5. Relationship of Program to group's mission & to City's mission	10	--	--
6. Support for group from volunteers -Size of organization	10	--	5
7. Collaboration with other providers -Duplication of effort	10	4	5
8. Plan for evaluating effectiveness of proposed project	10	--	15
9. Leveraging of other funding sources -Matching funds	10	4	10
10. Quality of budget justification	10	35	10
11. MBE/WBE	--	--	5
	=====	=====	=====
TOTAL	100	100	100

An evaluation team consisting of four individuals will be established to rate each of the proposals. It is recommended that the makeup of the team consist of one member from the following departments/agencies:

City Finance Department  
City Parks and Community Services Department  
Office of the Mayor  
United Way or other outside organization

#### FINANCIAL DATA

This report is for information only. There are no expenditures associated with the recommendations.

#### POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The criteria used in the evaluation process and the weight given to each, should reflect the Council's priorities. The proposed evaluation process gives a high priority to effectiveness of the proposed program, and the quality of the Community Group's needs assessment, program objectives, and budget justification. Less emphasis is given to the size of the organization, the relationship of the proposal to the group's mission, and collaborative efforts with other agencies. The Committee may choose to modify, add or delete any of the criteria outlined above.

The City received a request for \$7,000 from the Children's Agenda after the budget hearings were completed. The \$7,000 would be used to fund half a Planning Assistant position. The Committee has the option of including this request in the grant process, or limit the review to only those requests that were submitted during the budget hearings.

#### MBE/WBE EFFORTS

The program criteria from other agencies has been amended to include a component on the Community Group's affirmative action practices.

Budget and Finance Committee  
Report Back on Guidelines for Community Service Grant  
August 14, 1990  
Page 6


RECOMMENDATION

This report is for information only. It is requested that Council provide staff with direction on whether to modify the proposed criteria. Unless otherwise directed, staff will proceed with issuing grant applications to those groups listed above.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bill Farley  
Senior Management Analyst

Approved for Committee Information:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Crist  
Deputy City Manager

August 14, 1990  
All Districts

Contact Person:  
Bill Farley, 449-5845

## Community Group Funding Requests

Description	Proposed Budget	Additional Funds Requested	Recommended		Refer To		Refer to Community	
			Additional General Fund	Recommended Other Funds	Arts & Enter. Regrant. Prog.	Service Grants	Defer Request	
<b>Community Group Requests</b>								
Alternative Transportation Measures	500,000	0						
Area 4 Aging Ombudsman	34,000	18,500					18,500	
Camellia City Center	74,300	0						
Chamber-Capitol to Capitol Trip	8,600	0						
Community Service Planning Council	15,000	25,000					25,000	
Convention/Visitor Bureau	0	355,500	355,550					
Cultural & Entertainment Dist.	0	125,000	125,000					
Drug Abatement Instiute	0							
Homeless Task Force	0	50,000					50,000	
Human Rights/Fair Housing Com.	35,000	0						
Hunger Commission	0	18,250					18,250	
Inst. Design & Exper. Art (IDEA)	0	74,745				74,745		
Jazzworks	0	0				0		
KVIE Building Fund	34,000	0						
Metro Arts Regranting	55,000	331,000	331,000					
Miriam Gray's Acting Studio	0	73,200				73,200		
Old Sacramento Management Board	55,000	78,000		78,000				
Operation Conerstone	0	25,000					25,000	
Police Athletic League	0	50,000					50,000	
Railfair 91	0	100,000		100,000				
Sac School Dist. Cultural Exchange	7,500	7,500					7,500	
Sacramento Local Cons. Corp. Recycl	0	30,000		30,000				
Sacramento Mediation Center	30,000	10,000					10,000	
Sacramento Sports Commission	14,000	41,808		41,808				
Sacramento Theatre Company	0	28,430						28,430
Sacramento Tomorrow Coalition	0	10,000					10,000	
SACTO	100,000	0						
Sacto Valley Prod. Theatre Co.	0	20,000				20,000		
Salvation Army	0	2,335					2,335	
Sierra 2	0	0				0		
SOCA - Photo Inventory	0	20,000					20,000	
Stanford Settlement	10,000	0						
Subpoena Authority H.R./F.H	0	0						
Trees for Tomorrow	0	23,450					23,450	
Community Service Grants	0		150,000					
<b>Total Community Group Request</b>	<b>972,400</b>	<b>1,517,718</b>	<b>961,550</b>	<b>249,808</b>	<b>167,945</b>	<b>260,035</b>	<b>28,430</b>	