

CONSOLIDATED COMMUNITY FUNDING POOL

FY2023-2024 AWARD CYCLE RFP I

SAC CHAIR REPORT

Background

On Wednesday, January 5, 2022, a 24-member resident volunteer SAC, representing multiple regions of the county which included retirees and employed individuals in both the public and private sectors, began their review and evaluation of 132 proposals submitted in response to RFP#2000003360 Consolidated Community Funding Pool FY 2023-2024 award cycle. Four subcommittees were established and charged with the responsibility of the review and evaluation of 32-34 proposals each over ten weeks. Each subcommittee appointed a chairperson for oversight and to participate as a subcommittee representative in the SAC Chairs' meetings.

The SAC subcommittees were further divided into two 3-member teams and met virtually on a weekly basis through early March to complete the evaluation of the proposals. SAC chairs also met virtually several times during the 10-week period to discuss recommended awards and restoration funding for the approval of the full SAC on March 22, 2022.

Outcomes

A proposal score of 80 out of 100 points was established as the cutoff for recommending programs for award. Final recommended awards and a restoration list of 16 programs was approved by the full committee on March 22, 2022. The recommendations included the funding of 85 human services programs, or 64% of the 132 proposals received. These 85 programs support a large number of community needs as follows: 38 (45%) support direct needs such as food, shelter and medical assistance, 49 (58%) support education, literacy or financial stability, and 39 (46%) support social, community, and positive behavior services. Eight Programs (9%) are new (submitting first grant requests). (See the attached Funding Analysis). Total funding recommendations are \$8,817,132 for FY2023 and FY2024 respectively.

The funding recommendations were presented to Fairfax County staff to be submitted to the County's Board of Supervisors. The SAC recommendations were submitted as a NIP (Not in Packet), dated May 2, 2022, to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration and approval. Included in the NIP were analyses of the funded programs for the FY 2023-2024 award cycle. Please see the attached for further details.

Recommendations:

Post task completion, SAC Members were surveyed about their experiences and recommendations for future SAC cycles. Responses were largely supportive of the practice and the volunteers felt their combined 1350 volunteer hours were well spent. As with each cycle, SAC Members made numerous recommendations to enhance the quality of the program and the process. Below is a summary of some of the main points:

SAC Orientation

- Offer more than one orientation session and record them for SAC members to be able to refer back if needed.
- Review the documents requested as part of the proposal and how they can be used by SAC members as part of their evaluation process.
- Provide more clear criteria for scores to improve consistency of scoring across all subcommittees.

TAC Tools, Comment Sheets, Member Involvement

- Review and explain the tools and how they may be useful to SAC members.
- Some SAC members found TAC comments and member involvement helpful, and others found the information requested from TAC members redundant, and not helpful or necessary to have TAC members' attendance at meetings.

Proposal Evaluation Process

- Streamline and shorten proposal and requested forms. Many sections seemed overlapping, redundant, or unclear, and made it difficult to score. Use the same sections and scoring for both under and over \$50,000 proposals.
- Make review criteria more qualitative, i.e., not just whether or not something was addressed, but how effectively or completely it met the criteria requested in the RFP.
- Require SAC members to provide more specific strengths and weaknesses, i.e., not terms like "great" or "wonderful." (Vagueness more a problem with strengths than weaknesses).
- Have a mechanism for "normalizing" scores across subcommittees to make the scoring less dependent on which subcommittee any particular proposal was assigned to.

SAC Member Experience Improvement

- Make SAC members more aware of time commitment at recruitment. Improve the proposals and evaluation criteria as indicated above to shorten and make the process clearer for the volunteer community SAC members.
- Some members would prefer in-person (including meals) SAC meetings, and some preferred online, so perhaps give members the option for both.
- Because each subcommittee is broken down into two teams, but there is only one subcommittee member assigned as the chairperson, a mechanism should be developed for the subcommittee chairs to better represent the team on their respective subcommittee that they do not participate on.
- Pull in a willing group of SAC members to come up with improvements to the process, RFP documents, forms, evaluation criteria, etc.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to work with other residents of Fairfax County that want to give back and make a difference. It was a pleasure to work with Michelle Brizzi and the Fairfax County Staff. Not only were they responsive and professional, but they also each displayed a keen passion in their work.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Karen Mellon". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Karen Mellon, SAC Chair

Consolidated Community Funding Pool

FY 2023-2024 AWARD CYCLE RFP II

Chairman's Report

This was my first year participating and it brought some changes to the process of review. We started with a group Orientation and review of the system being implemented called Bonfire for all Selection Advisory Committee members (SAC) in December over three sessions. In our RFP II we were responsible for review of Emergency Housing and Food and had 12 community SAC members to review 24 proposals over the next 3 months. We were divided into 3 groups. Group A – Emergency Housing, Group B – Emergency Housing and Group C – Emergency Food. Each group had their own subcommittee chair and me acting as the chair for the RFP II. The review cycle began the week of January 3rd.

Each subcommittee met independently weekly over zoom with support from the County until they were done reviewing their proposals in March. At that time, they came together to discuss distribution of funding.

Funding Distribution

Each Subcommittee reviewed their scoring, and the chairs came together with the full committee to be sure we had the full support of the SAC. After reviewing, we determined it was best for the funds to get to the community through the organizations once it was identified that there was more community need than had been requested through the proposals. We allocated \$5 million dollars for emergency food and housing, with \$4 million (80%) going towards emergency housing and \$1 million (20%) for emergency food.

This is what our SAC methodology was for funding to the County:

Utilizing the full minimum funding allocation approved by the BOS for emergency food and housing, the SAC directs staff to negotiate funding allocations based on the existing needs data to ensure adequate basic needs are resourced throughout the county. Staff are directed to negotiate in accordance with the SAC scored offeror rankings (highest to lowest) to ensure target resources allocations are available within the zip codes. If the highest ranked offeror is unable to fulfill the targeted resource allocation, the negotiation team will sequentially negotiate with the next highest ranked offeror until the targeted resource allocation is achieved.

Funding for CCFP FY 23-24 RFP II was distributed according to proportion of need. To determine the proportion of need, the number of contacts during FY2021 (July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021) for Emergency Food Assistance and Emergency Housing Assistance in each zip code in Fairfax County was obtained from Coordinated Services Planning. Contacts about Emergency Housing Assistance accounted for 80% of contacts, and Emergency Food Assistance accounted for 20% of contacts. Using this ratio, the number of contacts about Emergency Food and Emergency Housing Assistance within each zip code were added. The total within each zip code was then

divided by the total for the county, so that each zip code had its own percentage, and the percentages from all the zip codes equal 100%.

The final combined funding of emergency food and housing per Human Service Region based on proportion of need: Region 1 (29.1%), Region 2 (34.7%), Region 3(20.7%) and Region 4 (15.5%)

CCFP FY 2023-2024 Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) Feedback and Survey Results RFP II

Summary

There were 46 members of the overall team and 22 completed the survey. Of RFP II we had a 91.7% response rate; the average satisfaction score was 4.1 on a 5-point scale.

Program Observations from Survey

- Orientation needs to be more overarching to give big picture view to new reviewers
- Provide FAQs or reference documents for review later from training
- Orientation needs to explain role from beginning to end to better prepare reviewers for all parts of the process
- Request more input and insight from County support participating in meetings – lots of positive feedback for all members just would like more guidance
- Proposal language needs works – it is unclear to SAC and possibly to some of the grant writers what is being asked and missing some key information
- TAC sheets and reviewers underutilized and not clearly understood. Key tool that needs to be revamped in future to get better use in the future. Only one TAC team member spoke.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to work with other volunteers in Fairfax County that chose to get involved and participate in the process. It was a pleasure to work with Michelle Brizzi, Ramona Carroll and the Fairfax County Staff. They each displayed a wonderful attitude, dedication and caring no matter what the hour as worked together through the process.

Respectfully submitted,



Erin S. Laughlin

SAC Chair 2022