



HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

March 7, 2013

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

A G E N D A

Thursday, March 7, 2013
(6:30pm)

Conference Room #1

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- * February 7, 2013

OLD BUSINESS:

- * 1. FY 2013-2014 Human/Public Service Funding Board recommendation

NEW BUSINESS:

- * 1. Memo regarding Human/Public Service Application and Criteria
- * 2. Public Meeting management, Robert's Rules of Order- Information Only
- 3. Metro Transit LAC Update- Maye

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS:

ADJOURNMENT:

MATERIALS TRANSMITTED

Star (*) indicates printed material within the agenda packet.

CITY OF PORTAGE HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

Minutes of Meeting, February 7, 2013

CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Sandra Sheppard, Chair

MEMBERS PRESENT: Diane Durian, Effie Kokkinos, Ray LaPoint, Nadeem Mirza, Edward Morgan, Sandra Sheppard, Kelly Williams (arrived at 7:00 p.m.), Amanda Woodin

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Elma (Pat) Maye

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tim Wilger (Youth Advisory Committee Liaison)

STAFF PRESENT: Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: A motion was made by Mirza and supported Morgan to approve the January 16, 2013 minutes as written. Motion passed, 7-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **FY 2013-2014 Human/Public Service Funding Board recommendation:** Sheppard began the discussion with a review of the staff funding recommendations memo. Money then briefly reviewed the memo, provided an explanation on the recent funding changes, and that staff recommended funding each current applicant at FY12-13 levels and then divided remaining funds between the applicants based on how staff had ranked them. Money reminded the Board that the Portage Community Center (PCC) funding was the combined total of General Fund and CDBG monies and that amount was \$116,513 for FY12-13. Sheppard then acknowledged that staff had not recommended any funding for Prevention Works (PW) while noting that it was a worthy program but other sources of assistance may be provided. Sheppard had also not recommended any funding of PW and, when the question was posed, no Board member responded that they had recommended funding PW. The Board then discussed how they reviewed the funding recommendation and their own suggestions. Some Board members calculated funding recommendations by taking an equal percentage of each applicant's request. The reasoning behind this method was to eliminate historical inaccuracies that may have occurred and providing equal treatment to applicants with regards to cuts. LaPoint felt this method might punish applicants who asked for what they needed versus those that asked for more than they required. Money pointed out that funding amounts have been based on previous years funding (if applicable) and that applicants apply for grant monies with knowledge of the process and the criteria. As many applicants currently had budgets in place, omitting consideration of current funding levels could negatively impact current grantees and services offered to Portage residents. The Board discussed differences in how funding amounts were determined every year, how ranking can vary each year, and how the ranking and criteria may need to be re-evaluated because applicants operate differently than years ago, and some criteria may need changes. By way of example, most applicants do not have offices in Portage, yet come directly to Portage to offer direct services, such as the Housing Resources, Inc. foreclosure prevention service. Discussion continued with the Board coming to a consensus that ranking was a valuable tool, and future emphasis should be placed on both ranking and requested funding amounts. The Board discussed that Gryphon Place received less than other applicants, but based on the fact that they did not provide a direct service, it was justified. Money pointed out that there was enough combined General Fund and CDBG monies to fund all applicants at the FY12-13 level with \$1,128 remaining. A variety of options were discussed and the following motions made: LaPoint made a motion to fund all current applicants at the same amounts granted in FY12-13, with the remaining \$1,128 to go to PCC. Motion failed for lack of support. A second motion was made by Williams, supported by Kokkinos to fund all current applicants at the same amounts granted in FY12-13, with the remaining \$1,128 to be split equally between the five top applicants. Motion failed 4-4. A third motion was made by Mirza and supported by Durian to fund all current applicants at the FY12-13 amounts with the remaining \$1,128 to be split equally between the YWCA, HRI, Catholic Charities, and Gryphon, with an explanation offered from Durian that PCC was to keep their city funding levels below 30%. Motion failed 2-6 (Mirza and Durian voting yes). A final motion was made by Woodin, supported by Morgan, that the Board recommend to City Council that current

applicants be funded at the FY 2012-13 levels with the remaining \$1,128 to be allocated amongst the top five ranked applicants in a manner similar to the methodology used by staff (i.e., higher ranked applicants receive a higher percentage increase in funding), however, with the percentage funding increases to reflect the Board ranking of applicants. In addition, while final figures were not calculated by the Board, staff would subsequently provide final figures for confirmation, which were estimated to be similar to the staff recommendations. Upon voice vote, motion passed 7 - 1 (Williams voting no).

Following the vote, the Board agreed to review the evaluation criteria at the March Board meeting so that the following year funding decisions could be more easily made. In addition, it was confirmed that a quorum will present for the April 4th regular Board meeting.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, Woodin moved and Mirza supported a motion that the meeting be adjourned. Motion passed 8-0. Meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth Money, Neighborhood Program Specialist

CITY OF PORTAGE**COMMUNICATION****TO:** Human Services Board**DATE:** February 28, 2013**FROM:** Vicki Georgeau, ^{VB} Director of Community Development**SUBJECT:** Human/Public Service Funding Allocation

On February 7, 2013, the Human Services Board approved the following motion: that current applicants be funded at the FY 2012-13 levels with the remaining \$1,128 to be allocated amongst the top five ranked applicants in a manner similar to the methodology used by staff (i.e. higher ranked applicants receive a higher percentage increase in funding), however, with the percentage funding increases to reflect the Board ranking of applicants.

Pursuant to the motion made regarding funding allocation, the amounts below were calculated based on the Human Services Board ranking of applicants.

General Fund

Agency/Rank	FY 12-13 Funding Amount	FY 13-14 Funding Amount	% Increase from FY 12-13
1. Portage Community Center	\$80,513	\$83,905	1.0% ¹
2. Housing Resources, Inc.	\$17,400	\$17,548	0.9%
3. YWCA	\$8,570	\$8,634	0.8%
4. Catholic Charities (ARK)	\$9,080	\$9,139	0.7%
5. 211/Gryphon Place	\$2,000	\$2,011	0.6%
6. Prevention Works		\$0	N/A

CDBG Fund

1. Portage Community Center	\$32,000	\$33,454	1.0% ¹
-----------------------------	----------	----------	-------------------

¹ The combined General Fund and CDBG Fund recommendation for PCC above equals a combined \$117,359, which represents a 1.0% increase from FY 12-13

Because actual funding allocations were not finalized at the February 7th Board meeting, the Board must take action on March 7, 2013 to confirm the FY 2013-14 funding allocations shown in the tables above are consistent with the motion approved on February 7, 2013.

CITY OF PORTAGE

COMMUNICATION

TO: Human Services Board

DATE: February 28, 2013

FROM: Vicki Georgeaux ^{WJ} Director of Community Development

SUBJECT: Human Service Funding evaluation criteria and review process

In response to the discussion at the February 7, 2013 Human Services Board meeting, staff has reviewed the Human Public/Service Funding Application and Human Services Funding Evaluation Criteria. Revisions to these documents and the review process are recommended, which should improve review of grant applications by the Board. As additional information, a history is provided on the development of the current evaluation criteria and application form to explain how the funding process has developed over the years.

History:

The evaluation criteria form was developed in the 1990s by the Board and staff to provide a frame work for developing funding recommendations. The criteria (attached) was similar to the existing evaluation tool and included a weighted point system for nine criterion. Accessibility to Portage residents was awarded with the highest number of points, while addressing a critical need received the second highest point allocation. The Board implemented use of the criteria to various levels over the years, but it was not until more recently that a concerted effort to utilize the tool for the Board review developed.

In 2007, a comprehensive review of the evaluation criteria was initiated. Other funding agencies were contacted and review processes utilized by the City of Kalamazoo, the City of Battle Creek, the Greater Kalamazoo United Way, LISC (Local Initiatives Support Corporation), and Department of Housing and Urban Development were analyzed. In the fall of 2007, revisions to the evaluation criteria were made, which included: updating/expanding criterion wording (adding more specific details to determine points awarded); elimination of the user fee criterion; adding criterion regarding the amount of funding leveraged by other funding sources; increasing points earned for programs that meet a basic human need; and revising points earned for the use of volunteers.

The updated evaluation criteria were used by the Board to rank agencies for the FY 2008-09 funding cycle. Subsequently, the Board used a "Continuous Quality Improvement" (CQI) process to evaluate additional revisions to the criteria, application, and process as determined appropriate. For example, and with regard to the Board review process, a second meeting was added each January to allow the Board to focus solely on their scores and come to a consensus on ranking. In addition, to improve Board deliberations, staff provided their scores and ranking of applications, as well as funding recommendations, concurrent with the Board review.

From 2008 through 2010, additional reviews and minor changes were made that further narrowed the criteria, focused the application questions, and assisted in streamlining the review process further. In

2012, changes were made to question 24 on the application to assist in the cost determinations for programs being funded.

Recommendations:

Based on the above, and in response to the Board discussion on February 7th, the following recommendations are provided for consideration:

- 1) There is currently limited Board training on how to review the applications against established evaluation criteria. It would be ideal to set aside time at the regular December meeting for staff and Board members to review the application form, the evaluation criteria, and the review process to ensure a consistent approach.
- 2) The evaluation criteria relate to specific questions in the application. It is recommended that the corresponding application question number be listed on the evaluation criteria form to assist the Board (see attached).
- 3) It is recommended that each Board member submit grant application scores for each evaluation criterion, as well as total grant application scores. In this regard, it is recommended that the Board Member Application Evaluation Summary Form be altered (attached). In this manner, during Board discussions on scores and rankings, differences can be discussed, changes or corrections made, and Board consensus can be more readily achieved.

Attachments: Evaluation Criteria (original tool)
Human Services Funding Evaluation Criteria (current tool with revisions shaded)
Board Member Application Evaluation Summary Form (current and proposed)

Evaluation Criteria

Human/Public Service Funding Request
 Applicant Name: _____ Fund: _____

Criteria	Rating (circle one)	Multiply by Weight Factor	Criteria Score										
1 Accessibility of Service to Portage Residents:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Not Accessible</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Easily Accessible</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	Not Accessible				Easily Accessible	x 30 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
Not Accessible				Easily Accessible									
2 Extent to which the Program addresses a Critical Need in Portage:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Not a Critical Need-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Critical Need</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	Not a Critical Need-				Critical Need	x 15 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
Not a Critical Need-				Critical Need									
3 Relation to other Service Delivery Systems:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Duplicates or Fragments Service Delivery</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	Duplicates or Fragments Service Delivery				Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery	x 10 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
Duplicates or Fragments Service Delivery				Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery									
4 Nature of Clientele:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">No Special or Unusual Needs</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Economically or Socially Deprived</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	No Special or Unusual Needs				Economically or Socially Deprived	x 10 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
No Special or Unusual Needs				Economically or Socially Deprived									
5 Use of Unpaid Volunteers:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">No Use</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Extensive Use</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	No Use				Extensive Use	x 10 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
No Use				Extensive Use									
6 Ability of Agency to Receive other Funding:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Extensive</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Limited</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	Extensive				Limited	x 10 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
Extensive				Limited									
7 Amount of Outreach Efforts:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">No Outreach</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Extensive Outreach Efforts to People in Need</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	No Outreach				Extensive Outreach Efforts to People in Need	x 5 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
No Outreach				Extensive Outreach Efforts to People in Need									
8 Number of Portage clients Served:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Few</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Many</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	Few				Many	x 5 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
Few				Many									
9 Utilization of User Fees:	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Not Utilized</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Utilized when Feasible</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	3	4	5	Not Utilized				Utilized when Feasible	x 5 =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
1	2	3	4	5									
Not Utilized				Utilized when Feasible									
			TOTAL =	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>									
			APPLICANT OVERALL RATING (TOTAL /100) = <input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>										

HUMAN SERVICES FUNDING EVALUATION CRITERIA

In addition to the criteria listed below, which apply to the service(s) to be provided with the funding requested, the following Mission Statement for the Human Services Board will also serve as a guide to the Board in its review and recommendation of funding applications:

The mission of the Human Services Board is to facilitate the satisfaction of the basic human needs of all Portage citizens by educating and advising the City Council, Portage human service agencies, and the community at large.

1. EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROGRAM ADDRESSES A BASIC HUMAN NEED
(QUESTION 15 ON APPLICATION)

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Basic Human Needs” are considered to include:	Score
Provision of housing (e.g. emergency, transitional, permanent, homelessness prevention such as eviction, foreclosure, and/or utility shut-off prevention)	50
Provision of food (e.g., direct food distribution, food bank/pantry, Meals on Wheels)	40
Provision of transportation or health care services (e.g., direct free/low-cost assistance to individuals/families)	30
Provision of job training/educational services or recreational services	20
Provision of clothing (e.g. direct, free/low-cost clothing and/or distribution)	10
None of the above	0

2. ACCESSIBILITY OF THE PROGRAM SERVICE TO PORTAGE RESIDENTS
(QUESTION 16 ON APPLICATION)

5 = Not Accessible to 25 = Easily Accessible

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Accessibility” can be considered to be:	Score
Services located in Portage	25
Services regularly provided in Portage (e.g. at PCOC, City Hall, Senior Center, Portage Schools, Police/Court offices and other similar locations)	20
Services accessible after normal (8 a.m.-5 p.m.) business hours, 24-hour phone hot line, or other methods	15
Services available / accessible via public bus routes and/or transportation by agency	10
None of the above	5

3. EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROGRAM ADDRESSES A CRITICAL NEED IN PORTAGE
(QUESTION 17 ON APPLICATION)

5 = Not A Critical Need to 25 = Critical

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Critical Need” can be generally considered to be such if identified high or medium priority in one or more of the following official, published documents:	Score
City of Portage FY 2005-09 CDBG Consolidated Plan and/or annual City Council goals	25
City of Portage Comprehensive Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, Recreation Plan or Portage 2025 Visioning Project Final Report	20
Local (e.g., Portage and/or Kalamazoo County specific) needs analysis/reports regarding human/public services	15
State or national needs analysis/reports regarding human/public services	10
None of the above	5

4. DOES APPLICANT HAVE WORKING RELATIONSHIPS / COLLABORATIONS WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS SERVING PORTAGE RESIDENTS?
(QUESTION 18 ON APPLICATION)

5 = Fragments Service Delivery to 25 = Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Coordinates or Improves Service Delivery” can be generally considered to be:	Score
Services are unique in community and not duplicated by others	25
Services are similar to others but carefully coordinated to avoid duplication	20
Services are similar to others but Information and Referral is routinely provided to avoid fragmentation	15
Services are similar to others and some fragmentation of services occurs	10
None of the above	5

5. OF PORTAGE RESIDENTS SERVED, ARE MAJORITY ECONOMICALLY OR SOCIALLY DEPRIVED, SENIOR CITIZENS OR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES?
(QUESTION 19 ON APPLICATION)

5 = No Special or Unusual Needs to 25 = Economically or Socially Deprived

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Economically or Socially Deprived” can be generally considered to be:	Score
Clientele is extremely low income and/or disabled and/or victim of abuse and/or other situation	25
Clientele is low income and/or senior citizens	20
Clientele is vulnerable or at risk of one of the above	15
Clientele is in need of services	10
None of the above	5

6. NUMBER OF PORTAGE CLIENTS SERVED
(QUESTION 20 ON APPLICATION)

5 = Few to 25 = Many

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Many” clients served can be considered to be:	Score
Portage clients equals 51-100% of clients served by agency	25
Portage clients equals 31-50% of clients served by agency	20
Portage clients equals 16-30% of clients served by agency	15
Portage clients equals 7.6-15% of clients served by agency	10
Portage clients equals 0-7.5% of clients served by agency	5

7. AMOUNT OF OUTREACH EFFORTS
(QUESTION 21 ON APPLICATION)

5 = No Outreach to 25 = Extensive Outreach Efforts to People in Needs

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Extensive Outreach” can be considered to be: regular newsletter distribution; cable access PSAs; advertisements/marketing campaigns; service listing in I&R databases/directories (2-1-1, United Way, etc.); presentations to community organizations/schools; open houses; coordination/provision of services with/at other agencies; participation in community collaborative efforts (e.g., MPCB, KLAHP, etc.)	Score
Utilizes 5 or more methods of outreach to Portage residents	25
Utilizes 4 methods of outreach to Portage residents	20
Utilizes 3 methods of outreach to Portage residents	15
Utilizes 2 methods of outreach to Portage residents	10
Utilizes 1 method of outreach to Portage residents	5

8. USE OF UNPAID VOLUNTEERS
(QUESTION 22 ON APPLICATION)

5 = No Use to 25 = Extensive Use

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Extensive Use of Unpaid Volunteers can be generally considered to be:	Score
Unpaid volunteers equals 51% or more of the agency’s full-time equivalent (FTE) employees	25
Unpaid volunteers equals 31-50% of the agency’s FTE employees	20
Unpaid volunteers equals 21-30% of the agency’s FTE employees	15
Unpaid volunteers equals 11-20% of the agency’s FTE employees	10
Unpaid volunteers equals 0-10% of the agency’s FTE employees	5

NOTE: If unpaid volunteers are inappropriate due to the type of services provided by organization, applicant get score of fifteen.

9. For new programs/agencies in the community for less than five years, use criterion 9(A).
For programs/agencies in the community for five or more years, use criterion 9(B).
(QUESTION 23 ON APPLICATION)

9(A). ABILITY OF AGENCY TO RECEIVE OTHER FUNDING **OR**

5 = Extensive to 25 = Limited

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Limited” ability to receive other funding for “new” applicants can be generally defined as follows:	Score
Grant request equals 51% or more of the agency’s budget	25
Grant request equals 31-50% of the agency’s budget	20
Grant request equals 11-30% of the agency’s budget	15
Grant request equals 6-10% of the agency’s budget	10
Grant request equals 0-5% of the agency’s budget	5

9(B). ABILITY OF AGENCY TO LEVERAGE OTHER FUNDING

5 = Limited to 25 = Extensive

(Select only one that most closely fits)

“Extensive” leveraging of other funding for “previous” applicants can be generally defined as follows:	Score
Grant request equals 0-5% of the agency’s budget	25
Grant request equals 6-10% of the agency’s budget	20
Grant request equals 11-30% of the agency’s budget	15
Grant request equals 31-50% of the agency’s budget	10
Grant request equals 51% or more of the agency’s budget	5

Board Member Application Evaluation Summary Form

Board Member Name: _____

TABLE 1: GENERAL FUND HUMANS/PUBLIC SERVICE APPLICATION REQUESTS		
Applicant	Program	Application Score
Catholic Charities	The ARK Shelter and The ARK Community Services	
Gryphon Place	2-1-1/HELP-LINE	
Housing Resources, Inc.	Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Services	
Prevention Works	Prescription Drug Abuse Awareness Video Projects	
YWCA	Sexual Assault, Domestic Assault, and Mentoring Programs	
Portage Community Center	Youth Development, Program Coordination & Development	

TABLE 2: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT REQUEST		
Applicant	Program	Application Score
Portage Community Center	Emergency Assistance, Transportation Assistance and Youth Recreation scholarships	

Board Member Application Evaluation Summary Form

Board Member Name: _____

TABLE 1: GENERAL FUND HUMANS/PUBLIC SERVICE APPLICATION REQUESTS										
Applicant	Criterion Points									Total Application Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Catholic Charities										
Gryphon Place										
Housing Resources, Inc.										
Prevention Works										
YWCA										
Portage Community Center										

TABLE 2: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT REQUEST										
Applicant	Criterion points									Total Application Score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Portage Community Center										

PROPOSED

Attachment 2 –

Robert's Rules of Order

Basic Principles

- ✦ Parliamentary procedure exists to facilitate the transaction of business and to promote cooperation and harmony.
- ✦ All members have equal rights, privileges, and obligations.
 - The majority has the right to decide.
 - The minority has rights, which must be protected.
- ✦ A quorum must be present for the group to act.
- ✦ Full and free discussion of every motion considered is a basic right.
- ✦ Only one question at a time can be considered at any given time.
- ✦ Members have the right to know at all times what the immediately pending question is, and to have it restated before a vote is taken.
- ✦ No member can speak until recognized by the chair.
- ✦ No one can speak a second time on the same question as long as another wants to speak a first time.
- ✦ The chair should be strictly impartial.



Adapted from Roberts Rules of Order, 10th edition

Attachment 3 –
Parliamentary Procedure “Lingo”

Motion

A proposal or resolution by a member that the assembly take a certain action or express a certain view. A motion is considered out of order if it conflicts with the constitution or by-laws of the group.

Main Motion

A motion to introduce a principal subject. Only one main motion may be considered at a time and must be disposed of before another main motion may be considered.



Motion to Lay on the Table (or Tabling)

A motion to lay aside a pending question for an indefinite amount of time.

Motion to Take from the Table

A motion enabling the assembly to resume consideration of a previously tabled item

Point of Order

To object to a proceeding as being in conflict with the rules of procedure. The chair must recognize the point.

Previous Questions

A motion to end debate, which requires the assembly to vote on the issue at hand. The motion must be suspended, requires a 2/3 vote, and is not debatable.

Friendly Amendment

A small change to an original motion. Those who made and seconded the original motion must agree to the amendment.

Motion to Adjourn

A motion made at the conclusion of a business meeting or at the final business session.

Majority Vote

More than half of the votes, or 50%+1

Quorum

The number of members required in the by-laws to hold a legal meeting.

Attachment 4 –
Handling a Motion

Three steps by which a motion is brought before the group

1. A member makes a motion.
2. Another member seconds the motion.
3. The chair states the question on the motion.

Three Steps in the Consideration of a Motion

1. The members debate the motion (unless no member claims the floor for that purpose).
2. The chair puts the question to a vote.
 - A. The chair restates the question.
 - B. The chair takes the vote:

"All in favor of the motion, say aye."

"Those opposed, say no."



A vote passes with a simple majority (except in cases of Suspending the rules, previous question, limit or extended debate & amend a previously adopted motion), which requires a 2/3 vote.

3. The chair announces the result of a vote. A complete announcement should include:
 - A. Report on the voting itself, stating which side prevailed (and giving the count if a count prevailed).
 - B. Declaration that the motion is adopted or lost.
 - C. Statement indicating the effect of the vote or ordering its execution.
 - D. Where applicable, announcement of the next item of business or stating the question of the next motion that consequently comes up for a vote.

Attachment 5 –

Parliamentary Procedures at a Glance

To do this	You say this	May you interrupt the speaker?	Must you be seconded?	Is the motion debatable?	What vote is required?
Adjourn meeting*	I move that we adjourn	No	Yes	No	Majority
Recess meeting	I move that we recess until...	No	Yes	No	Majority
Complain about noise, room temp., etc.*	Point of privilege	Yes	No	No	No vote
Suspend further consideration of something	I move we table it	No	Yes	No	Majority
End debate	I move the previous question	No	Yes	No	2/3 vote
Postpone consideration of something	I move we postpone this matter until...	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Have something studied further	I move we refer this matter to committee	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Amend a motion	I move this motion be amended by...	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Introduce business (a primary motion)	I move that...	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Object to procedure or personal affront*	Point of order	Yes	No	No	No vote, chair decides
Request information	Point of information	Yes	No	No	No vote
Ask for actual count to verify voice vote	I call for a division of the house	No	No	No	No vote
Take up a matter previously tabled*	I move to take from the table...	No	Yes	No	Majority
Reconsider something already disposed of*	I move we reconsider our action relative to...	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Vote on a ruling by the Chair	I appeal the Chair's decision	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority

*Not amendable

Adapted from Roberts Rules of Order, 10th edition



Michigan Association of Planning
A Chapter of the American Planning Association

Planning and Zoning Officials Academy Vol. 11, No. 8

Meeting Management Made Easy

By Carolyn Torma

Have you ever sat in an out-of-control meeting where planning commissioners were focusing on the wrong issues and the public was unruly? Meetings can be run effectively, decisions can be well documented and easy to follow, and even long agendas can be completed on time. This article presents some useful tips for sound meeting management as well as providing references for where to find more help in managing your meetings better.

While most planning commissioners will participate in formal planning commission meetings, planning agencies and commissioners are increasingly using a variety of meetings to accomplish planning goals.

The Importance of Meetings

The most compelling reasons for meeting are to:

1. inform everyone of potential actions,
2. develop an understanding of issues and consequences, and
3. reach agreement for taking the actions that will ultimately affect the community.

A single meeting cannot always satisfy all those purposes. This is especially true if the commission is considering a very large project or plan. The group interaction will need to occur in a series of different kinds of meetings. Here is a brief list of the kinds of meetings in which planning staff and often planning commissioners participate.

Types of Meetings

Michigan Association of Planning
219 South Main Street, Suite 300 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Phone: 734.913.2000 Fax: 734.913.2061 web: planningmi.org

Sharing information and monitoring. This is often termed "telling and selling." An example is a neighborhood meeting in which a new program of neighborhood-level grants is first announced. A second example might be a meeting between planning staff and a developer to conduct an informal review of a project proposal.

Decision making and problem solving. These meetings are called "probing and exploring." Here, the end result of the meeting is not known, but the purpose is. The group has identified a problem and, through discussion, better defines the problem and begins to identify solutions. An example is the parks and recreation department meeting with youth-related agencies to discuss how to improve youth recreation programs.



Creative/idea-generating. In these meetings a designated group finds the solution. An example might be a meeting of middle school youth and staff that explores youth recreation needs and their solutions. Staff facilitates the meeting, and city council members and planning commissioners serve as sounding boards.

Social and ceremonial. No real business is conducted in these meetings, rather the purpose may be to end a project. Examples are meetings to bestow historic preservation awards, honor retiring planning commissioners, or celebrate the opening of a new park.

Legislative/administrative. These meetings are formal and result in decisions that are upheld by law. In some states, planning commissions may serve as quasi-judicial or administrative entities, with final decision-making authority, as in the approval of a final plat of a subdivision or a conditional use. More typically, the city council or other elected body is the legislative body and makes the legally binding decisions for the community. A city council meeting is a legislative meeting. In some communities, quasi-judicial or administrative decisions by planning commissions or boards of zoning appeals may be appealed to the legislative body.

Advisory. Most planning commission meetings are advisory. Although the decisions reached by the advisory group are not legally binding, the meetings are still conducted in a formal manner and follow proper rules of order. The advice developed through this meeting is presented formally to the legislative group. All decisions and recommendations are carefully documented. Sometimes a planning commission will meet with the city council to discuss joint expectations and to review commission recommendations over the past year.

Common Meeting Management Problems

Some meetings will combine the functions outlined above. In a planning process, it is also common for meetings to be done in stages as the planning progresses. Also,

Michigan Association of Planning
219 South Main Street, Suite 300 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Phone: 734.913.2000 Fax: 734.913.2061 web: planningmi.org

make certain you know when these meetings must be public and when they can be more informal and involve only certain parties. Sunshine or open meetings laws or requirements in a municipal charter affect meeting location, notice, and content.

The size of the group will affect how you interact and what you will enact. As a rule, the larger the group, the more formal and carefully planned a meeting must be. Large groups cannot accommodate open-ended discussion well. Undoubtedly, your planning commission already has administrative rules or bylaws for how it conducts its meetings. Make certain you know what they say. Review them carefully with your senior staff to ensure your meetings meet legal requirements. For more information on the legal requirements of conducting planning commission meetings, see "You Be the Judge," *The Commissioner*, Summer 1996.

Confusion may arise when planning commission meetings are used to solve problems. As much as possible for major issues, hold working meetings and well-facilitated public meetings prior to the commission meeting to allow for genuine problem solving to occur. Often the commission meeting itself is too late in the process to try and get substantial public input on major projects. For more routine hearings, public input at the planning commission meeting works fine.

Debra Stein, a San Francisco consultant who works with developers to guide their projects through the review and adoption process, has written a book on meeting management. From her perspective, a common problem with planning commission meetings that get out of control is the unrealistic expectations that everyone places on a single meeting. She believes it is unreasonable for the public and officials to think that the planning commission meeting is the place to resolve complex planning and development issues. Public involvement has to be addressed in a more comprehensive manner. Otherwise, the public may feel that its voice is being ignored.

Bill Lamont, AICP, a Denver planning consultant, adds that not all planning commission meetings are consensus-building meetings. There are times decisions will be made that do not please segments of the population. The decisions must be made in the best interest of the community as a whole. As long as the planning process has been thorough and fair, and it garners adequate community support, the planning decisions made by the commission have a good chance of holding over time. Planning commissioners must be prepared for the controversy and the occasional lack of consensus.

Preparation

One key to well run meetings is good preparation. Every meeting must:

Begin with the agenda. In planning commission meetings, staff and the commission chair create the agenda. The agenda must be available to the public and distributed to

Michigan Association of Planning
219 South Main Street, Suite 300 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Phone: 734.913.2000 Fax: 734.913.2061 web: planningmi.org

the commissioners and key participants sufficiently in advance of the meeting. It should identify the location of the meeting, the date, and start and end times.

A useful addition to an agenda is the time at which each item on the agenda will begin and end. As much as possible, the chair should adhere to the time schedule. A common problem is not setting time limits for discussion, resulting in overly long discussions. When this happens, you lose the attention of your fellow commissioners and participants. Therefore, setting and keeping time limits is important. If you set limits on presentations and comments, make certain everyone knows the time limit rule. Publish the time limits and the meeting management rules so speakers can prepare their remarks.

Orient new members and public attendees. The public should be oriented at the beginning of the meeting by the chair. The chair should review the principal rules of conduct, the purpose of the meeting, and the manner in which it will be conducted. Orientation for commissioners should occur in a separate meeting. Part of any orientation should include discussions of:



- The roles of chair, commissioners, staff, public, and presenter.
- The basis on which decisions are made and what documents guide decisions, such as the local comprehensive plan, zoning and subdivision ordinances, and state enabling legislation.
- The decisions the planning commission is authorized to make.
- Rules of conduct for meetings.
- Ethics and rules of official conduct for commissioners.
- Provide the commission with staff-prepared background materials prior to the meeting. It is crucial that commissioners read this material before the meeting and be prepared to speak to it. Here is what staff should provide as background materials:
 - Agenda
 - Proposal and copies of site plans and where appropriate, elevations of projects.
 - A staff report that provides:
 1. A review of local ordinance requirements pertinent to the proposal.
 2. An analysis of site conditions.
 3. Relevant materials in the local comprehensive plan.
 4. Comments or suggestions from other local government departments.
 5. A recommendation.

Running the meeting

A meeting must be led. The chair must:

1. move the meeting along to a successful conclusion,

Michigan Association of Planning
219 South Main Street, Suite 300 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Phone: 734.913.2000 Fax: 734.913.2061 web: planningmi.org

2. make certain all items on the agenda are addressed, and
3. maintain order.

The chair convenes the meeting on time and, if possible, ends on time. This establishes the discipline for the meeting.

The chair also sets the tone of the meeting. This tone helps maintain order and respect for the process. The chair should:

- Be well briefed on all issues (he or she must do the homework).
- Project a sense of order, discipline, and dignity while remaining calm and impartial.
- Avoid taking sides on an issue while in the role of chair. The chair will typically vote last in a decision by the commission.
- Insist that everyone speak politely and in an orderly fashion; name calling, personal attacks, noisy outbreaks, and rude behavior must not be tolerated.
- Make certain that the meeting follows the legal requirements.
- Make certain that decisions are based on the information before the commission.
- Ensure that the reasons for the decisions are well documented and relate clearly to the comprehensive plan and relevant ordinances.
- Ensure that everyone has a reasonable opportunity to be heard without dominating the proceedings.
- Ensure the meeting is objective and fair to all parties.

The chair's role is not the only important role. Being a good follower as a commissioner is also critical. Most of the same rules apply: be well prepared, help maintain an orderly and fair meeting, substantiate opinions based on the planning documents and data.

The meeting is conducted by the commission and with public input. Staff members are active prior to the meeting, preparing materials for the commission; at the meeting, they are typically responsible for introducing the project and the staff report with recommendations. To do this, they may use slides or other visuals. Visual materials, including maps, plans, slides, and graphics, must be clear and intelligible. The planning director and commission chair should work together with other staff members to set a high standard for these presentations. Finally, presentations should be systematic and thorough, but not tedious in their detail. Copies of relevant information should be readily accessible to the public.

Developers or other presenters also have a role. Most often their projects are presented by staff, but they may be given an opportunity to comment or respond to questions. If the developer presents his or her own project, the same guidelines stated above apply.

The public is invited to listen and comment during planning commission meetings. The chair should make it clear when these comments are welcome and how they should be made. For example, the chair explains that speakers must use the microphone in order that their comments be recorded and heard throughout the room. Again, the chair sets time limits and enforces them.

If your commission does not have clear administrative rules for meetings, it is strongly suggested that you adopt some. Consult your local government attorney about questions of procedural due process and complying with statutes or local ordinance or charter requirements. Your meeting management policies can reach far beyond legal issues and address issues such as visual documentation, time limits, maintaining order, etc.

Recording the actions

Planning commission meetings must be recorded. The secretary shapes the information into a written record. Minutes must be made available to commissioners and the public in a timely fashion. Some communities use their web site as a way of keeping the public informed. Posting minutes in a public area is also a good idea.

The decisions that the commission makes must be clearly written and properly substantiated.

Debriefing the meeting

Michael Chandler encourages planning commissions to debrief after their meetings. He also recommends that each commissioner complete a short meeting evaluation. This serves as a check for the commission on how well they achieved their goals and what actions they need to take to improve their meetings.

Running meetings effectively takes practice and patience. This article gets you started.

This article was based on a workshop conducted by Carolyn Torma, APA Education Manager, and Michael Chandler, Professor & Extension Community Planning Specialist, Virginia Tech University, in April 1998.