



City of San Marcos

**Meeting
Human Services Advisory Board
November 16, 2023, at 6:00 pm**

**Attend in person
San Marcos City Hall Complex – Building 4
630 E Hopkins Street
San Marcos, Texas**

or

**Attend virtually online
[https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86003313927?pwd=NFhIM1hTRTJD
UkNabXdBdGRLaHsQT09](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86003313927?pwd=NFhIM1hTRTJDUkNabXdBdGRLaHsQT09)**

Passcode: 473160

or

Join by Telephone

Dial 346 248 7799

Webinar ID: 860 0331 3927

Passcode: 473160

The presiding officer for this meeting will be present at the meeting location described above.

Note: The weekly Board Packet usually only contains the Agenda because all program applications were provided to the Board at the beginning of the review cycle. All information that has been provided to the Board is on the HSAB webpage:

<https://sanmarcostx.gov/HSAB>

I. Call To Order

II. Roll Call

III. Citizen Comment Period:

Each speaker will be provided up to three minutes to speak.

IV. MINUTES

1. Consider approval, by motion, of the minutes from the November 9, 2023, Human Services Advisory Board meeting.

V. PRESENTATIONS

1. Receive a brief presentation from staff on the compiled preliminary scores and proposed allocations created by Board members for the applications for the Human Services Grant Funding.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

1. Hold a staff-facilitated discussion among Board members on the FY 2023-2024 Human Services Grant applications for the purpose of comparison, evaluation, and selection, to create a recommendation to City Council on which applicant agencies should receive funding and how much funding should be granted to each selected agency, and consider approval by roll call vote of the resulting recommendations.

VII. REPORTS

1. Receive updates from Board members on activities since the last meeting.

VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Board Members may provide requests for discussion items for a future agenda in accordance with the board's approved bylaws. *No further discussion will be held related to topics proposed until they are posted on a future agenda in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act.*

IX. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH PRESS AND PUBLIC.

This is an opportunity for the Press and Public to ask questions related to items on this agenda.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Notice of Assistance at the Public Meetings

The City of San Marcos is committed to compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Reasonable modifications and equal access to communications will be provided upon request. If requiring Sign Language Interpreters or alternative formats, please give notice at least 2 days (48 hours) before the meeting date. Individuals who require auxiliary aids and services for this meeting should contact the City of San Marcos ADA Coordinator at 512-393-8000 (voice) or call Texas Relay Service (TRS) by dialing 7-1-1. Requests can also be faxed to 855-461-6674 or sent by e-mail to ADArequest@sanmarcostx.gov.

For more information on the Human Services Advisory Board, please contact Carol Griffith, Housing and Community Development Manager, 512-393-8147, cgriffith@sanmarcostx.gov



**City of San Marcos
Human Services Advisory Board
November 9, 2023, at 6:00 pm
Building 4 Conference Room and Virtual**

Regular Meeting - Minutes

I. Call To Order

Chair Cherif Gacis called the meeting to order at 6:07pm.

II. Roll Call

Board Members	Present	Absent
Cherif Gacis, Board Chair	In Person	
Gloria Quinn, Vice Chair	Virtual	
Yansi Arevalo, Voting Member	In Person	
Clayton Carlisle, Voting Member	Virtual	
Monica Gonzales, Voting Member	No longer on the board	
JoAnn Parsons, Voting Member		x
Kourtney Welch, Voting Member		x
Mariana Zamora, Non-Voting Advisory Member	Virtual	
Staff		
Carol Griffith, Housing and Community Development Manager	In Person	

With four out of seven voting members present, a quorum was in attendance.

Chair Gacis announced that Board Member Monica Gonzales is no longer on the Board due to lack of participation.

III. Citizen Comment Period:

Lisa Marie Coppoletta spoke about the purpose and responsibilities of this Board.

IV. MINUTES

1. A motion for approval of minutes for the meetings below was made by Board Member Yansi Arevalo and seconded by Board Member Clayton Carlisle. Minutes were approved unanimously for the following Human Services Advisory Board meetings:
 - a. September 7, 2023
 - b. September 14, 2023
 - c. September 21, 2023
 - d. September 28, 2023
 - e. October 5, 2023
 - f. October 12, 2023
 - g. October 19, 2023
 - h. October 26, 2023

V. PRESENTATIONS

1. The Board received a presentation from Carol Griffith, Housing and Community Development Manager, on the compiled preliminary scores and proposed allocations created by Board

members for the applications for the Human Services Grant Funding. Ms. Griffith also reviewed some philosophical issues for consideration when making decisions, which had been included in the Board's orientation packet. (Presentation is hereby attached to these minutes)

VI. ACTION ITEMS

1. Ms. Griffith and Chair Gacis facilitated discussion among Board Members on the FY 2023-2024 Human Services Grant applications for the purpose of comparison, evaluation, and selection, to create a recommendation to City Council on which applicant agencies should receive funding and how much funding should be granted to each selected agency. The Board discussed ten programs individually, beginning with the programs that scored the lowest. All decisions were considered to be preliminary. By consensus of the Board it was agreed that this discussion would continue at the next Board meeting, scheduled for November 16.
2. The second action item was to consider approval of the 2024 Human Services Advisory Board Annual Calendar. A motion for approval of the calendar as presented was made by Board Member Carlisle and seconded by Board Member Arevalo. The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. REPORTS

No updates were received from board members on activities since the last meeting.

VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

No future agenda items were requested.

IX. QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH PRESS AND PUBLIC.

Lisa Marie Coppoletta complimented the Board on the discussion held this evening.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Arevalo moved to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Carlisle seconded. The motion passed unanimously and Chair Gacis adjourned the meeting at 8:01pm.

Attachments:

1. Presentation
2. Spreadsheet showing results of funding allocation discussion so far

Minutes submitted by:

Carol Griffith, Staff Liaison

Approved by the Board November 16, 2023:

Cherif Gacis, Board Chair

PRESENTATION ON SCORING COMPILATION 11/09/23

Hello! As you know, I am Carol Griffith, Housing and Community Development Manager. I am the staff liaison for this board. I compiled the scores provided by the Board Members into a tally sheet and I will go over how this is arranged in just a few minutes.

Before I do that, I will review a few points I presented at the Board orientation on August 17 and which were included in the original board packet provided with all the application material. I instituted scoring a few years ago with the City Manager transferred this Board to the Community Initiatives Division and asked staff to make the process more transparent and objective. That is, staff tried to make the process more scientific by creating scoring as a way for the Board to consider which agencies provide what San Marcos needs most, and which provide the most impact for the funding. Here are the decision considerations that were in your orientation materials:

Decision Considerations:

- **Consider highest priority needs.**
- **It's not whether the non-profit is local – it's what the non-profit is doing for local people.**
- **Do not place more weight on personal passions – what is needed by the community?**
The point of the scoring system is to consider what is most needed by San Marcos and what programs best provide for the top needs. Funding is limited and should be given to the highest impact programs that deal with the highest priorities for the community. Board members are expected to be neutral representatives of the community's needs.

The goal is to select the programs that will have the most impact on the highest priority needs of this community.

- **Use the entire range of scoring, from 0 to 100.**
Scoring was introduced a few years ago in order to create a more objective and transparent system of choosing funding recipients. The Board will attempt to prioritize applications through the description of the need for the program in the community. DO NOT score using only the top part of the range – use the entire scale from 0 to 100 so it will be easier to differentiate among the organizations when it's time to recommend which will be funded and how much.
- **Look for most impact (either depth or breadth).**
Applicants should be sure and make a strong case for the need. In addition, the Board will have to choose which programs have the most impact on those needs. Impact can be felt in the community from programs that either serve people in depth over time, or which serve a great many people for a very specific need.
- **Do not fund all applicants.**

In addition to those considerations, the Board is encouraged not to fund all applicants. Over the past few years this has split limited funding among more and more applicants, creating a situation where such low funding per program may limit impact to the community instead of making meaningful contributions to the ability of the program to function.

It does not make sense to fund all applicants for several reasons.

- 1) Providing a small portion of the requested funding may cause the program to not be able to be administered as proposed.
- 2) It encourages more and more applicants to apply, thinking that everyone who applies will get something. Additional applications are great; splitting the funding in smaller and smaller pieces makes it less and less impactful on the community.
- 3) It does not prioritize the use of funding based on the Board's understanding of the most critical needs for San Marcos, and the highest impact on those needs.
- 4) It encourages agencies to apply for more funding than they actually need and assume they will only receive a small portion of it.
- 5) It causes significant time to be spent on administering the grant by City staff.

- **Do not assign percentages across the board as a means of distributing funding.**

In addition, staff will be reminding the Board to concentrate on the formal scoring system as the mechanism for making the decisions on which programs should receive funding. Assigning percentages across the board or referring to personal passions in the decision-making process will be discouraged. The Board members are representatives of the broader community and your recommendation should be focused on the greatest community impact as you make the difficult choice of which programs to fund out of so many worthy and useful programs.

- **Do not include perceived additional resources in your consideration.**

Finally, all applicants should be considered equal for consideration of this funding. This process does not provide the depth of financial information that would be necessary to determine whether the funding is "needed" by the agency. Some programs have been around for years and seem to be well established and well funded, and others are newer or smaller and may seem to have fewer resources. This should not be taken into account as part of the decision. Every human services agency and program must continually work to ensure that they have adequate funding by applying for grants and raising funds from donors. The consideration for funding is how this particular funding should impact the San Marcos community, not whether the agency is perceived to need the funding. They are all in need and are all equal applicants in this process.

What should be done instead?

Score and rank applications and then use that scoring to select which agencies will receive funding

The goal is to run a strategic and meaning competitive process that selects the programs that will have the most impact on highest priority needs in this community

Before I go over the scores provided by Board members, are there any questions or discussion on the overall philosophies of scoring and funding the applications?

Scoring Tally:

RISK TALLY TAB: First I'll go over the risk tally. A score of 0-14 is low risk, 15-29 is moderate risk, and 30 or more is high risk. This is the perceived risk of the agency not being able to successfully carry out their program and positively impact San Marcos.

Although some programs were scored as high risk by one or two Board members, if the scores are averaged, it ends up that 8 are considered moderate risk and none are considered high risk. It is worth noting that the Seek Institute and Boys and Girls Club were each considered high risk by two Board Members.

I'm happy to answer any questions about risk evaluation.

Now let's talk about scoring.

EVAL TAB: First I entered all the scores into excel

LOW-MED-HIGH TAB: Then I transferred everyone's totals for each program onto this spreadsheet, columns J-O

I sorted each Board Member's scores and found cut off points for each to determine which agencies were scored "low", "med", and "high", columns D-I. Low is pink, medium is yellow, and high is green.

RANGES TAB: I compared the ranges of the board members and decided the best way to make sure you are comparing apples to apples is to use the low-med-high designations.

LOW-MED-HIGH TAB: columns U-Z: I assigned 5 points for each low range score, 10 for each medium, and 15 for each high score.

In Column AA I averaged these scores

In Column AB I then arranged the programs in order of their average low-med-high score.

Staff does not usually create a recommendation and it is completely up to the Board how you go about choosing funding allocations.

ALLOCATIONS TAB: However, because I can see that Board members are tending to want to fund everyone, I created one possible scenario that is based entirely on the scoring.

LOW-MED-HIGH TAB: I tried to find a break point in approximate thirds – awarding programs with overall high scores full funding, awarding medium scores with partial funding, and not funding entities with lower scores

In Column AC you can see how this worked out. Programs with average scores of 12.5 through 15 could get full funding, 10-11.667 could get partial funding, and the rest no funding. Based on funding available, the partially funded programs could get 72% of their request, if the Boys and Girls Club is awarded a flat \$50,000 instead of 72% of their very high request.

Now I will show you a variation on this that may be better.

LOW-MED-HIGH NO ZAMORA TAB: I knew I had to show the scoring without our non-voting member, Mariana Zamora, so I created another tab for that. I removed her scores, and then compared the original results with the results without her, because I do respect her opinion and the knowledge she brings to the Board.

Removing her scoring changed the results for a few agencies.

- Boys and Girls Club moved from partial funding to no funding due to a lower overall score.
- Southside and School Fuel moved from partial to full funding since their scores went up.

In addition, in this scenario, the partially funded agencies could receive 85% of their request.

Although it is unusual for staff to make a funding recommendation, I am encouraging the Board to consider this because it uses the scores to make the decision. The scenario I column AD is staff's recommendation.

At this point I will facilitate the Board's discussion on funding allocations. First a double question for you all: 1) what do you think of staff's recommendation and 2) how were you picturing making this decision – that is, how do you prefer going about discussing the allocations?

Keep the discussion focused on:

- 1) What creates the most impact on the highest priority needs for this community?**
- 2) Is the scoring being used to inform the decision?**

Why do you believe this program should receive this funding?

What is an alternative way of having this discussion?

Num	Agency	Program	Parsons	Carlisle	Arevalo	Gacis	Quinn	No Z Tally Average	No Z Tally Average Order	Original Maybe	No Zamora Maybe	Requested	Minimum	No Zamora Maybe Funding	2024 Allocation	
5	Boys and Girls Club	Texas Preparatory School-San Marcos	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	0	0	\$325,000	\$97,000	\$0	\$0	
8	Centro Esperanza	Overhead Costs Needs Fulfillment	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	0	0	\$16,000	\$8,250	\$0	\$0	
16	Habitat for Humanity	Housing Counseling	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	0	0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
3	BCL of Texas	Homebuyer & Financial Empowerment Development Program	10	5	5	5	5	6	2	0	0	\$41,500	\$35,000	\$0	\$0	
32	Seek Institute	Community Wellness Initiative	10	5	5	5	5	6	2	0	0	\$70,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	
13	Girls Empowerment Network	Girl Connect	5	10	10	5	5	7	3	0	0	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$0	
26	Outsiders Anonymous	Outsider Peer Program	10	5	10	5	5	7	3	0	0	\$50,000	\$24,000	\$0	\$0	
28	Price Center	Healthy Living Programming	5	10	10	10	5	8	4	0	0	\$20,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$5,000	
10	Communities in Schools	Mental Health and Wellness Counseling Team	10	5	5	15	5	8	4	0	0	\$12,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	
22	Hill Country MHDD Centers	Mobile Crisis Outreach Team	10	10	5	5	15	9	5	partial	0	\$115,172	\$107,095	\$0	\$0	
30	San Marcos Youth Services Bureau	Facilities Grant	15	10	5	10	5	9	5	0	0	\$39,400	\$22,500	\$0	\$15,000	
2	Any Baby Can	Early Childhood Intervention (ECI)	10	10	15	10	5	10	6	partial	partial	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$25,500		
4	Bobcat Pride Scholarship Fund	Jeremy O. Torres Emergency Stabilization Fund (JOTESF)	15	10	15	5	5	10	6	partial	partial	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$4,250		
33	Society of St Vincent de Paul	Emergency services to the Poor and Needy in the San Marcos Area	15	5	10	10	10	10	6	partial	partial	\$25,000	\$0	\$21,250		
1	ACCEYSS Network	ACCEYSS STEEAAM Program	15	5	10	10	10	10	6	partial	partial	\$30,000	\$24,000	\$25,500		
29	San Marcos Consolidated ISD	School Age Parenting Program	15	10	10	5	10	10	6	partial	partial	\$15,000	\$0	\$12,750		
7	Cenikor	Youth Recovery Community	15	10	5	15	10	11	7	partial	partial	\$15,000	\$7,500	\$12,750		
6	Cenikor	Prevention of Substance Use	15	10	5	15	10	11	7	partial	partial	\$15,000	\$7,500	\$12,750		
15	Greater San Marcos Youth Council	Family and Youth Success (FAYS)	15	15	15	5	10	12	8	full	full	\$53,000	\$40,000	\$53,000		
11	Community Action of Central Texas	San Marcos Senior Citizen Center	15	10	15	10	10	12	8	full	full	\$20,000	\$18,000	\$20,000		
34	Southside	Specific Assistance, Shelter, Case Management	15	15	10	10	10	12	8	partial	full	\$80,000	\$50,000	\$79,000		
12	Court Appointed Special Advocates	Advocacy for Abused and Neglected Children in San Marcos	15	15	10	10	15	13	9	full	full	\$35,000	\$30,000	\$35,000		
14	Greater San Marcos Youth Council	Children's Shelter	15	15	10	10	15	13	9	full	full	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$15,000		
18	Hays County Food Bank	General Operations	15	10	10	15	15	13	9	full	full	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000		
20	Hays-Caldwell Women's Center	Roxanne's House (Child Abuse Program)	15	15	10	10	15	13	9	full	full	\$31,250	\$31,250	\$31,250		
31	School Fuel	Weekend Food for Hungry Children in the SMCISD	15	10	15	10	15	13	9	partial	full	\$34,500	\$34,500	\$34,500		
24	Nostros la Gente	"Viva Zapatos" Shoe Drive	15	15	15	15	10	14	10	full	full	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$10,000		
25	Nostros la Gente	Coats Program	15	15	15	15	10	14	10	full	full	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$5,000		
19	Hays-Caldwell Women's Center	Non-Residential Family Violence and Transitional Housing Program	15	15	15	10	15	14	10	full	full	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$62,500		
17	Hays County Child Protective Board	Hays County Child Protective Board	15	15	15	15	15	15	11	full	full	\$25,000	\$15,000	\$25,000		
9	Combined Community Action	Meals on Wheels Rural Capital Area	15	15	15	15	15	15	11	full	full	\$15,000	\$10,000	\$15,000		
21	Hays-Caldwell Women's Center	Sexual Assault Program	15	15	15	15	15	15	11	full	full	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$25,000		
27	Prevent A Litter (PALS)	Helping Underserved People for a Healthy Community	15	15	15	15	15	15	11	full	full	\$45,000	\$0	\$45,000		
														\$650,000	\$30,000	

no funding - ok to apply next year

no funding now but if have left over, fund with stipulations

no funding - ok to apply next year

no funding - ok to apply next year

no funding - ok to apply next year

come back to this one

come back to this one

come back to this one

come back to this one

85%

85%

85%

85%

85%

minus \$1000