



## Legislation Text

---

File #: 21-1649, Version: 1

---

### CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

Approve the proposed CY2022 Social Services Grant funding allocations

**DEPARTMENT:** Community Services

**SUBMITTED BY:** Shebnem Ozkaptan, Budget/Administrative Services Coordinator

**BOARD/COMMISSION REVIEW:**

N/A

**BACKGROUND:**

The City Council established a \$250,000 Social Services Grant (SSG) program in 2005 to enhance the ability of local not-for-profit agencies to provide needed services to the community. In 2012, the Council increased funding to \$300,000 to allow for a \$50,000 set-aside for projects that target current specific community needs. Grant funding was increased to \$500,000 in 2015, and remains today, using a portion of the Food and Beverage Tax funds. The total allocation is divided as follows:

450,000

This amount is reserved for agencies that provide services addressing one of the program's five general funding priorities (listed below) for low to moderate income residents.

*1. Emergency Services*

Emergency shelter, food and personal care items, and emergency assistance

*2. Seniors*

Respite care, meal delivery, home sharing, mental health counseling

*3. Self-Sufficiency*

Financial counseling, education, childcare, employment services, and substance abuse services

*4. Special Populations*

Persons with physical, developmental or mental health disabilities

*5. Youth*

Mentoring, counseling, pregnancy prevention/education

\$50,000

The remaining \$50,000 is reserved for councilmembers to propose allocations to initiatives of their choice.

## Scoring Criteria

Applications are evaluated based on the extent to which they meet the following seven criteria:

1. Project goals and objectives are clear, measurable, realistic, and address the program priorities and documented community need.
2. Project need and community benefit are justified and fully documented.
3. The project provides a new or improved service to the target population that does not duplicate existing services and also encourages collaboration with other organizations.
4. The project provides services to Naperville residents conveniently and in sufficient numbers or provides crucial services to a subset of Naperville residents.
5. The applicant has sufficient experience, resources and staffing to successfully implement the project within a one-year timeframe and can manage the grant, including documentation of benefits, compliance and reporting.
6. The applicant has made efforts to secure other funding for the activity.
7. Completeness of the application.

## **DISCUSSION:**

For the CY2022 funding year, the City received 36 requests totaling \$1,097,738.

Of that number, 24 applications totaling \$810,239 were for programs addressing the five general funding priorities listed above and 12 applications requested funding for Mental Health Awareness and Prescription Drug Abuse Prevention programs for a total amount of \$287,499.

From the CY2022 applications, 28 projects had previously received SSG funding.

A seven-member evaluation team made up of representatives from the Community Services Department, Mayor's Advisory Commission on Disabilities, Human Rights and Fair Housing Commission, Naperville Police Department, and Senior Task Force reviewed and scored the applications based on the criteria described above.

The evaluation team applied the following methodology for allocating \$450,000:

- Review each application individually and determine a unified team recommendation.
- Prioritize grantees with high scores, demonstrated success, and a focus on low-moderate income residents.

The \$50,000 reserved for the City Council was allocated by a two-step calculation process:

### Step 1 - Individual Councilmember Recommendation (amount used to calculate the Unified City Council Award)

- When councilmembers recommended different funding amounts for a project, the average funding was calculated.

*For example:*

*Councilmember 1 - \$10,000 for Project A*

*Councilmember 2 - \$3,000 for Project A*

*Councilmember 3 - \$5,000 for Project A*

$\$18,000/3 = \$6,000$  Individual Councilmember Recommendation

- If a single councilmember recommended an increase, that figure was used.

*For example:*

*Councilmember 4 - \$5,000 for Project B*

$\$5,000/1 = \$5,000$  Individual Councilmember Recommendation

**Step 2 - Unified City Council Award:**

- The Individual Councilmember Recommendation was then multiplied by a factor based on the number of councilmembers who allocated funding [the number of councilmembers recommending the funding divided by the number of councilmembers participating in the allocation process].

*For example:*

*3 councilmembers recommended funding of \$6,000 for Project A*

*8 councilmembers participated in the allocation process*

$3/8 = .38$

$\$6,000 \times .38 = \$2,250$  Unified City Council Award

- The Unified City Council Award was rounded to the nearest hundred dollars and added to the evaluation team's recommendation for a total applicant award.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

\$500,000 from annual Food and Beverage Tax revenue will be allocated to Social Services Grant recipients.