



COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Meeting – Wednesday, March 2, 2022
7:00 pm - BY MS TEAMS

Present:	Irina Elderidge	Domenica Mastromatteo
	Alex Alejandro Estoup (Vice Chair)	Con McQuade
	Cathy Harvey	Joshua Peters
	Ellison Mallin (Chair)	
Staff:	Eirikka Brandson, Social Planner	
	Mary Jukich, Committee Clerk	

1. Welcome

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

2. Adoption of Agenda

MOVED, seconded and resolved
To adopt the agenda.

CARRIED

3. Adoption of the February 16, 2022 Minutes

MOVED, seconded and resolved
To adopt the minutes.

CARRIED

4. Review of Grant Process

At the February meeting, the committee was presented with an overview of the new process for evaluating grant applications. However, as several questions and concerns were raised, members were provided with an opportunity to continue the discussion around the process.

On discussion, some of the comments from the members were as follows:

- Before the Committee moves too far into the process, it is important to have a clear idea of what the process will look like at the end. A suggestion was presented that grant applications are either approved in full, or not approved at all, and there is a ranking system that is used as a method to eliminate applications.
- If the Committee proceeds with an all or nothing approach, whether there was a risk of damaging relationships with organizations.
- Generally organizations apply for grants in the \$1,000/\$2,000 range and will not put too much reliance on whether the application is successful. The amounts of the grants are not significant and organizations are not dependent solely on funds from the DNV.
- The Committee has an opportunity to provide funding, or partial funding and this should not be lost with an all or nothing approach. It may also be beneficial to provide organizations with information to assist them with preparing better proposals in order to receive funding.
- The new process may be problematic if the results of the combination of all the Committee members' assessment are not close.
- There may not be enough information on some of the applications, and whether it was possible to do an informed reconciliation at the end without doing some of the analysis beforehand.
- If a grant discount is based on the criteria score that each organization gets, then if members give 5's and 4's rankings in the first month, 2's and 3's rankings in the second month this will become problematic for those organizations reviewed in the third month.
- As the total request amount exceeds the budget amount, it may not be possible to fully fund every organization.

- A member's knowledge and experience on the Committee could be offset by someone else on the committee who may not have significant knowledge about the issues, and that the inexperience of some members may hurt the process.
- A suggestion was presented to develop a mathematical process that could translate on how to score applications so that the amount of funds granted would be based on a percentage. With a collective ranking, points could be attached to certain criteria and when the application is reviewed, there is a formula and the recommended amount could be calculated.
- There may be a problem with reviewing the applications in pairs because there may be a possibility for unequal reviews of the applications. One member may make reasonable reductions in the grant amounts and another member be hasty in their analysis and want to review in full.
- If one members ranks a "1", and another ranks a "12" on the same category, this may indicate that the ranking is not representative. It is important to know and have clarity around what the reconciliation process will look like because some members were not aware that if they discounted a grant, there was an additional discount at the end of the process.

- A concern was raised with respect to how pairs make a recommendation on funding and how members do the initial assessment of grant application, whether the evaluation criteria is being applied at that stage, or if members are proceeding with an arbitrary process.
- A suggestion was presented that after the presentations are completed, each Committee member would do their own evaluation of the applications, or perhaps four or five members could review each application.
- Review of applications may be less arbitrary if a math calculation was used.
- In terms of budget and potential shortfall, it may be that none of the applications will receive more than 56%, and a discounted on a global basis, and to ignore the shortage of funds is the core problem. No one knows if there is a worthwhile program, and it should be all or nothing and either accept the grant as worthwhile or not provide funding.
- The Committee may wish to decide the grounds upon which it would recommend a reduction of the grant amount and also, as a Committee, decide to be consistent in the recommendations about grant amounts. If as pairs, the Committee recommends a reduction of the grants at this stage, the evaluation criteria might be useful in terms of reconciliation.
- There has to be a method/reason to have the option to reduce the application.
- The Committee may wish to develop some reasons for recommending a reduction of the grant amount.

It was noted that the purpose of implementing the scorecard was so that at the end of the process, there would be information indicating the top to lowest ranking, and this information would enable the Committee to make a decision around reconciliation of grant amounts. In this regard, it was recommended that the Committee proceed using the scorecard in terms of putting forward the recommended grant amount. It was noted that the criteria developed was based on policy, the guiding principles and goals, and the evaluation criteria noted on the grant application forms.

The Committee was also informed that one member has indicated that based on personal reasons, they will not participate in the weighted evaluation or reconciliation process. They have agreed to submit individual recommendation forms including the evaluation tables for the applications they review. In this regard, by a show of hands (4 yes, and 1 abstention), members indicated that they had no issues with the member not participating in the above mentioned processes.

5. Community Grant Applications

As a result of the discussion around the grant review process the proposed grant application presentations were moved to the next meeting.

- Athletics for Kids Financial Assistance (BC) Society (Operating)
- BC Pets and Friends
- Belweder North Shore Polish Association (Operating)
- Belweder North Shore Polish Association (Program) – Creative Workshops
Connecting North Shore Residents
- Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention Centre of BC (Program) –
Advanced Suicide Training
- Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention Centre of BC (Program) –
YouthinBC.com
- Lookout Housing and Health Society (Operating)

6. Accountability Forms

Members provided a brief overview on the Accountability Forms from each of the agencies, noting some of the challenges and successes over the last year:

- Camp Kerry Society
- Crisis Intervention

The following Accountability Forms will be reviewed at the next meeting.

- Canadian Mental Health
- North Shore Safety Council

In terms of moving forward with the presentations of grant applications, members indicated a consensus that the presentations be scheduled in alphabetical order as per the allocation spreadsheet.

7. Any Other Business

- Athletics for Kids – Conflict of Interest

There was a discussion around a potential conflict of interest between the assigned committee member and organization assigned to review their application. As a result, a different committee member volunteered to review this application.

- Grant Allocation (updates) and Committee Resignations
Rebecca Ferguson and Bahar Tajali have resigned from the Committee.
- Update on the request for Deputy Clerk regarding meeting procedures
This update will be brought to the next meeting.

8. Determine Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, March 9, 2022.

9. Adjournment

MOVED, seconded and resolved
To adjourn the meeting.

CARRIED

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.

District Vision Statement

Our goal is to be recognized among the most sustainable communities in the world as demonstrated through our environmental stewardship, strong network of neighbourhoods, a vibrant economy and community-driven growth and change.