



INDIANA COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY SERVICE & VOLUNTEERISM
Meeting Minutes

November 28, 2007
10:00 AM – 3:00 PM

**Indiana Government Center
302 W. Washington Street
Conference Room 2
Indianapolis, Indiana**

Commission Chair David Reingold called the meeting of the Indiana Commission on Community Service and Volunteerism to order at 10:08 AM, followed by the roll call. Those commissioners in attendance were:

Rick Bentley	Belinda Munson
Eric Butler	Jim Perry
Aleeah Livengood	David Reingold
Leo McCarthy	Adam Shoemaker
Jackie McCracken	Wesley Simms
Marty Moore	

The following OFBCI staff members were also in attendance:

Debbie Anderson	Janet Simpson
Carey Craig	Erin Wright
John Rentsch	Sandra Allen (VISTA)
Jim Rosentreter	Melissa Anderson-Traylor (VISTA)
Paula Parker-Sawyers	Brandy McCord (VISTA)

Commission Chair Reingold entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the October 11, 2007 meeting. Commissioner McCarthy made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Moore. The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Chair Reingold asked the new OFBCI staff members to introduce themselves. Following the introductions of VISTA Sandra Allen, VISTA Melissa Anderson-Traylor and VISTA Brandy McCord, Mrs. Parker-Sawyers introduced Jim Rosentreter. Mr. Rosentreter is OFBCI's new Account and Compliance Monitor. She advised the Commission that with the exception of VISTA Jessica Gegel, the rest of the 2006-2007 VISTAs had completed their year of service. The OFBCI will have six,

possibly seven, VISTAs for 2007-2008. She further advised the total number of VISTAs in Indiana was reduced this year. Therefore, programs had to cut their number of VISTAs. One VISTA position will be at the Family Christian Development Center in Nappanee and one will be at Prevent Blindness Indiana in Indianapolis. Currently, Jessica Gegel is working on a series of booklets that will be used for capacity building across the state. Brandy McCord shared with the Commission that she was the VISTA Volunteer Network Associate. Melissa Anderson-Traylor stated she was the VISTA Mentoring Outreach Associate and Sandra Allen advised she was the VISTA Capacity-Building Outreach Associate. Ms. Parker-Sawyers advised that Sandra would be assigned to the southern end of Indiana for capacity building. Sarah Fuchs, a fourth VISTA, who begins on December 10th, will be assigned to the northern end of Indiana. She further shared the OFBCI has recognized that not every not-for-profit who receives the Friday Night Facts or who has a need for capacity building can attend the Governor's Conference on Service and Volunteerism. Both Sandra and Sarah will be traveling and taking information out to the smaller organizations in the northern and southern end of Indiana. Commissioner McCracken asked why the number of VISTAs was reduced in Indiana. Ms. Parker-Sawyers advised if the CNCS State Office is unable to successfully fill all of the available positions then the number of positions is reduced the following year. Commissioner McCracken then asked what the original number had been and what that number is currently. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated it was her belief it changed from 60 to 55, but wasn't absolutely positive. She further stated that according to Louis Lopez, the quality of experience that the VISTAs have and in particular what is offered through the OFBCI is outstanding training for them for their next step in life. Commissioner Moore stated that the STARFISH Initiative as well as the 21st Century Scholars have also benefited from the VISTA program. He concluded by stating that the VISTAs are a very sharp group of individuals.

Commission Chair Reingold stated that he and Ms. Parker-Sawyers have been working on trying to address the lack of participation and absenteeism on the part of some of the Commissioners. He stated their absence made it difficult for the remainder of the Commission to conduct business. Those Commissioners have been thanked for their service and subsequently this has created an opportunity for Governor Daniels to fill those positions. Currently, there are 15 Commissioners and 6 vacant seats. The quorum is 8. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated there was a quorum for today's meeting. She further stated that because of the good work the Commission is doing, the OFBCI is in receipt of three or four names of people who would like to serve. Commission Chair Reingold said if anyone knew of someone who would like to serve to please pass their names on to either him or Ms. Parker-Sawyers. Those names would then be sent to the Governor's Office. Ms. Parker-Sawyers stated that in addition to their resume being needed that there was a need to know their party affiliation as well. She stated this is a requirement of the federal regulations and it is not a state requirement. The Commission has to have a 50-50 membership with one additional member of the party in power. Currently, this Commission would need to have one more member of the Republican Party. She further stated if someone is unwilling to identify their political party that it will reduce their chances of being appointed to the Commission.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers then asked Mr. Carey Craig to share with the Commission information regarding online ethics training. Mr. Craig stated that OFBCI staff members and commission members are required by law to complete ethics training every two years. Failure to complete the online course could result in receiving a letter, or possibly a sanction, from the Inspector General for the State of Indiana. He stated for those commissioners whose term had expired, although seeking reappointment, that they would not be required to complete the training. He also indicated if a Commissioner's term expired after December 7th they would still be required to complete the training. He continued by stating the training takes approximately 20 minutes and must be completed by December 7th. Mr. Craig then disseminated instructions as well as user names and pass codes for the Commissioners to access the system. This training is not scored; it is just a pass/fail grading system. Commission Chair Reingold asked if the question is answered incorrectly if you have an opportunity to correct it. Mr. Craig's response was the questions are designed so you cannot go onto the next section until that question has been correctly answered. Commission Chair Reingold asked if it was possible to have parts of the material available for review and Mr. Craig's response was no. Commission Chair Reingold then asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions. Mr. Craig asked that those Commissioners in attendance who are required to take the ethics training to let him know when the training has been completed. He also said if anyone had any questions, concerns or problems to let him know. Also, for the two Commissioners who were not in attendance, Mark Dobson and Louis Lopez, the information would be sent to them. He concluded by stating anyone not completing the online course would receive a phone call from the OFBCI.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers then directed the Commissioners' attention to the 2008-2009 Indiana AmeriCorps*State grant application timeline and process. As indicated, the process began on August 20, 2007 when the 2008-2009 AmeriCorps*State request for proposal was issued. OFBCI conducted five three-hour technical assistance workshops throughout the state between August 27th and September 6th, with a final technical assistance conference call held on September 21st. Interested applicants were required to submit, via e-mail, a Notice of Intent to Apply by 5:00 PM (EST) on October 3rd. Applications for new/recompetes were due by 5 PM (EST) on October 17th and November 5th for competitive continuations. The peer review panel was selected from October 17th to October 19th. Six individuals were selected from a variety of professional backgrounds, including grantmakers, experienced grant reviewers, nonprofit service providers, university faculty and staff as well as a former AmeriCorps member. On October 30th the peer review orientation conference call was conducted. This orientation covered AmeriCorps and national service, the request for proposals, application process, and reviewer expectations. The peer review panel convened to review proposal comments, rate proposal quality and develop preliminary funding recommendations on November 9th. Panel members met in small groups to discuss the proposals they reviewed. Following that meeting, members of the OFBCI staff reviewed the proposals. She continued by indicating that during today's meeting, the ICCSV will review recommendations and make decisions about which proposals should be sent to the Corporation for National and Community Service for consideration for competitive funding. The ICCSV will also determine which proposals should remain in contention

for Indiana AmeriCorps*State formula funding. Between November 28th and December 14th, OFBCI's National Service Program Officer and Account and Compliance Officer will conduct pre-award risk assessments of the new competitive applicants to determine the applicant's ability to fiscally and organizationally administer an AmeriCorps grant. Following the Commission's deliberations today, applicants will be notified of the preliminary funding decisions. Applicants with proposals being considered for the national competition will be asked to address any contingencies and submit to OFBCI no later than December 14, 2007. All competitive applications are due to CNCS on January 8, 2008. Ms. Parker-Sawyers then directed their attention to the time line for formula continuation requests and encouraged the Commissioners to review it. She reminded the Commissioners of the Corporation for National and Community Service's 2006-2010 Strategic Goals which are mobilizing more volunteers; ensuring a brighter future for all of America's youth; engaging students in communities; harnessing baby boomers experience; and disaster preparedness and response. Following the list of the Strategic Goals was a list of the peer reviewers. Three of the reviewers were from Indianapolis, one from Muncie, one from Bloomington and one from Huntington. Commission Chair Reingold thanked Commissioner Adam Shoemaker for serving on the peer review panel. Ms. Parker-Sawyers asked if anyone had any questions regarding the process. Commissioner Moore asked how the peer reviewers were selected. Ms. Parker-Sawyers stated that Ellen Brown, Gary Pavlechko, and Gail Thomas Strong were previous reviewers; Julie Howe is an AmeriCorps Alum as well as a past reviewer; Adam Shoemaker is one of the ICCSV Commissioners and Michelle Martin was a new reviewer. The next item discussed was the 2008-2009 Indiana AmeriCorps*State RFP Peer Review Panel Recommendations summary. The summary contains the recommendations of the peer review panel for the new and recompetes as well as the competitive continuation applications. Commissioner Simms asked if there was a limit as to how many applications could be sent to CNCS for competitive funding. Ms. Wright indicated there wasn't, however over the last few years Indiana has remained steady with only three programs receiving competitive funding each year (including new, recompetes and continuations). She further stated that information received from Indiana's Corporation program officer indicated it is going to be a very competitive year because there are a lot of continuation grants, but the Commission can send up as many as they choose. Commissioner Simms asked if there was any reason why all of the proposals couldn't be sent for competitive funding. Ms. Parker-Sawyers response was that this option had been discussed in the past, but the Commission decided not to. The Commission didn't want to give the Corporation the perception that proposals weren't given priority and possibly weaken any applicant's chances for funding. She reminded the Commission that when a grantee is in the second year of funding that those dollars are already committed. Subsequently it shrinks the amount of money available for any new grantees. That information was shared with the peer reviewers so they would understand that the recommendations for competitive grants should be the very best in order to have the greatest chance for funding. She reminded the Commission that in the past whatever proposals are sent for competitive funding, and aren't funded, have been funded with formula funds if available.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers then asked the Commission to direct their attention to the proposal from **Harmony Student Engagement Project/Harmony School Corporation** and asked Debbie Anderson to review the material with the Commission. Ms. Anderson advised the Harmony Education Center sponsored an AmeriCorps VISTA program from 2001-2005. Their mission was to increase the capacity with urban Indianapolis high schools to support viable service learning and youth voice projects. In their first year they engaged over 4,536 students. Harmony Corps is committed to increasing levels of student engagement in urban Indianapolis high schools and nonprofit social service agencies by unleashing the potential in our young people. They currently have 12 full time service members. Their host sites/member locations are six partner high school campuses in the IPS district. Five campuses adopted the small school model; therefore, there are 19 small high schools on those campuses. So, Harmony partners with 20 high schools in Indianapolis. The goal is to impact high school graduation rates in Indianapolis. Harmony proposes that 1000 IPS high school students will be involved in student engagement activities, which will lead to a 25% increase in personal leadership, self empowerment, and self efficacy in the students and 50% of the highly involved students will report a 25% increase in feelings of engagement in their school and community. Member activities will focus on youth voice and family and community engagement, which could include student leadership organizations, service learning projects, civic engagement and social justice projects, and leadership trainings. Their 2008-2009 AmeriCorps*State recompetete review indicates in 07-08 their member enrollment rate is 80% so far, compared to 100% in 06-07. Their retention rate was 67% in 06-07. In 06-07 they recruited 124 volunteers who gave a total of 642 hours served. She further stated their program is in compliance with the 30 day enrollment, 30 day change of status and 30 day exit in WBRS. Relative to whether or not they are in compliance with all deadlines, they were not in compliance 5 out of 19 times. They were also not in compliance 3 out of 10 times regarding full participation in required events. During the last fiscal monitoring review there were three findings, including issues with the trial balance, reconciling invoices to the general ledger and accounting procedures. The program monitoring review had one finding regarding documentation of criminal history. Corrective actions for these findings have approved by staff. The program met its performance measures for 2006-2007. They received an average score of 93.33% from the peer review panel. The panel recommended to fund at the amount requested and to send to CNCS for the competitive process. The peer review panel felt the proposal was strong discussing member recruitment, retention, and training; had a strong multi-site oversight model; the organization appears to be very capable of overseeing the grant; have sound financial path. The peer review panel noted areas for improvement are to include more on how reliance on federal support would be decreased and to stay within IPS not to expand as proposed. The staff gave this proposal an average score of 92.5%, recommending to fund at the amount request with contingencies. Those contingencies were to provide more information on their governance structure, especially with regard to the board; outputs and outcomes need to be further explained in their narrative; certain sections need more information on what is planned for 2008-2009 (versus what it hoped to accomplish in 2007-2008); and more directly state connected to CNCS strategic priority. Commission Chair Reingold asked if there were any questions or comments. Commissioner Simms asked if Harmony School Corporation had originally been funded

as a VISTA program. Mrs. Wright stated they were a VISTA program for four years focused on capacity building. Commissioner McCracken asked where they were located and Mrs. Wright stated they are located in Bloomington. Commissioner McCarthy asked if the competitive funding is for three or five years. Mrs. Wright stated a program can be competitively funded indefinitely, although they have to reapply. Ms. Parker-Sawyers pointed out that by the 10th year of a competitively funded program they have to have a 50% match. Currently, Harmony is at a 51% match which was taken into consideration by both the peer and staff reviewers. Therefore, it makes it appear as an even stronger competitor. Mrs. Wright stated the match from IPS is primarily in-kind donations (staff supervision, space, materials, etc.). Commissioner Perry referred to their performance measures which stated that 1000 IPS high school students will be involved in student engagement activities; 60% of “highly involved” students will report a 25% increase in personal leadership, self-empowerment, and self-efficiency; 50% of highly involved students will report a twenty-five percent increase in feelings of engagement in their school and community after being involved with Harmony Corps for at least one semester. He asked if they met their targets and goals last year. Mrs. Wright indicated yes. Commissioner Simms asked if it was possible to track some of these students long-term to see if there had been any real impact such as graduating from high school. Mrs. Wright indicated this issue came up in the peer review as well. She further stated Harmony Corps is supposed to report yearly on their performance measures. Commissioner Perry asked if they addressed looking at graduation rates in their proposal or how many students stayed in school versus dropped out. Commission Chair stated it is in Harmony’s interest to link “feel good” with tangible benefits. Commissioner McCracken indicated there are so many other variables you have to take into consideration as well and to say this is a direct cause and effect thing, would be difficult. Ms. Parker-Sawyers agreed this would be good information to have but indicated it should not be placed as one of their performance measures because of the variables, such as an IPS or systemic issue that Harmony cannot influence. If a student moves and no longer attends a particular school, it is reported as a drop out and not as a transfer. This is a variable that IPS has zero control over. Commission Chair indicated there were ways to get information as to the success of their program. Tracking, such as whether the kids they are working with are more likely to attend school regularly, versus performance measurements is very useful information and something they should be asked to do. Commissioner Perry made a motion to recommend this proposal for competitive consideration. Motion seconded by Commissioner Simms and passed 10-0-1 with Commissioner McCracken abstaining.

Commissioner Moore excused himself from the meeting.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers then began the discussion reference the grant application from **Volunteer Action Center (VAC)**. She shared this is a new grantee and was pleased to see their proposal because the OFBCI has been trying to engage volunteer centers around the state by making volunteers available to them and getting them to talk to one another. She indicated it shows that the seeds being planted are starting to bare fruit. She continued by saying the primary goal of the proposed AmeriCorps program is to provide organizations with a member who will assist in establishing a structured volunteer

program and develop and implement a recruitment strategy that generates the volunteer force needed to accomplish the service site's strategic and operational goals. The expectation is that through this temporary leadership, executive directors and boards will be given the time needed to understand the impact volunteers have on the success of their programs. Ms. Anderson reviewed the materials for VAC. They are requesting \$126,000 for 10 MSYs, 20 half time members. Their host sites/member locations are Bartholomew County, including the city of Columbus, and towns of Hope, Taylorsville, Elizabethtown, Edinburgh and Jonesville. Their members will develop the policies and procedures, volunteer positions, recruitment strategy, training and supervision, and evaluation and recognition activities essential to a quality volunteer program, resulting in an increased volunteer force making an impact on the health of nonprofits and the health of the community. They are in partnership with the United Way of Bartholomew County, Cummins Inc., Ivy Tech Community College and IUPUI Columbus. The peer review panel gave them an average score of 86.5% and the recommendation is to fund at the amount as requested, with contingencies, and send to the Corporation for the competitive process. Some of the peer review comments regarding the applications strengths were the program seems to have a strong manager and effective management plan, the applicant offers sufficient justification for the request of funds. The review panel noted areas for improvement around if this is a community need that money is needed for and if other partner funding groups will assure being able to hire a volunteer coordinator as proposed in the performance measures. Ms. Anderson further stated the average score from the staff was 60.3. The staff recommended funding at the amount requested, with contingencies, including that the applicant institute a 3-month development period followed by a 9-month operating period in Year 1, and not to send it competitively. Some of the staff reviewer comments were not seeing anything about relationships with other national service programs. One strength of the application is that it meets the Corporation and Indiana priorities. The narrative says that the organization wants a 3/9 grant, but the members will be serving for 10 months. The narrative also doesn't talk much about how the organization will utilize the 3-month period for planning. Commissioner Shoemaker asked if the applicant actually applied for a 3/9 grant and if so, would it meet the qualifications for a competitive grant. Mrs. Wright stated it could if the grant was tweaked and included information about the planning for the 3-month development period. Commission Chair Reingold asked if there were any other concerns or comments regarding the grant proposal. Commissioner Perry asked about their infrastructure. Ms. Parker-Sawyers stated out of the 21 volunteer centers in the state of Indiana that Bartholomew County and Porter County are the strongest. Commissioner Perry asked if the United Way has a paid volunteer coordinator. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated they have a paid staff member but didn't know if they had a paid volunteer coordinator. Commission Chair Reingold said this was a good discussion. Commissioner Perry stated if this proposal is approved to be sent for competitive funding that this grantee appears to have the ability to write a strong proposal. Commissioner Perry made a motion to recommend this proposal for competitive funding, seconded by Commissioner Munson. The motion carried 9-0-1, with Commissioner McCracken abstaining.

Commission Chair noted that neither application included money for an evaluation, which would strengthen their proposal. Commissioner McCracken stated that teaching grantees to include that is critical. Commissioner Simms reported that generally it is hard for programs to find a funder for evaluation. Carey Craig said that at the technical assistance training applicants were recommended to include evaluation funds. Commission Perry asked if it would be possible to institute a state evaluation. Commission Chair stated the topic could be put on a future agenda.

Following the vote, discussion ensued regarding the Competitive Continuation grants for **Indiana Mentor Corps/Indiana Juvenile Justice Task Force—Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring** and **Indiana University/Indiana Campus Compact**.

Commissioner McCracken excused herself from the room as a result of her involvement with Indiana University/Indiana Campus Compact. Commission Chair Reingold stated the vote for these two grantees is to continue their competitive funding. He further stated they could be voted on as a group. Ms. Parker-Sawyers began the discussion by stating an area of concern for Indiana Mentor Corps/Indiana Juvenile Justice Task Force—Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring is their member retention rate. Mrs. Wright indicated there were areas in their proposal that needed to be strengthened in order to comply. Regarding Ms. Parker-Sawyers' comment about OFBCI's concerns with their retention rate, they have begun to justify why their retention rates are low. They have recently moved over from Indiana University and some transition issues are to be expected. She further stated OFBCI has been receiving a lot of questions and concerns from them as well. Ms. Parker-Sawyers asked Mrs. Wright to share with the Commission some of the justifications offered. Mrs. Wright continued by stating one of the big ones is the nature of the population they are working with which leads to a high turn over rate as well as the supervision and training of members. Last year, 2006-2007, they instituted a new training program for their members with a goal of enhancing the members' ability to fulfill their service. AIM was originally set up under Indiana University. Their new fiscal agent is Indiana Juvenile Justice Task Force, and they are moving forward to become their own independent non profit. Commission Chair Reingold stated the grantee is doing what makes sense to them financially.

Commissioner Bentley asked if Roger Jarjoura was still the Executive Director. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated that Mr. Jarjoura was now the Chairman of the Board of AIM. She further shared that AIM was a project that began as a professor's research project and eventually grew into this program.

Regarding Indiana Campus Compact, Mrs. Wright continued, this grantee was not awarded a grant for the 2006-2007 program year. ICC was awarded a competitive grant for the 07-08 program year for the GrowIndiana program. To date, they have only filled 6 of their 72 slots, which is only 8% of their enrollment rate. Their proposal did not include an explanation. Ms. Parker-Sawyers asked if there has been any justification given. Mr. Carey Craig indicated because of the delay in the contracting process between the OFBCI and IU that they cannot issue contracts to sub-host sites. IU is unable to contract with those universities until their contract is in place with the State. Mr. Craig indicated he was confident this is part of the problem. Ms. Parker-Sawyers said that this

was a routine problem with IU Indianapolis and that getting contracts through them takes anywhere from 60 to 90 days for completion, and without a contract they cannot proceed. She stated the OFBCI will offer that explanation on behalf of this grantee if questions are asked from the Corporation. Unfortunately, there isn't anything that can be done. Ms. Parker-Sawyers asked Mr. Craig if the contracts were in place and Mr. Craig stated he could not advise if they were or not. Ms. Parker-Sawyers also said this is an internal process and isn't anything the OFBCI can control. Commissioner Simms asked if there was any idea how long it would be before everything is in place. Commissioner Perry stated this program had basically lost the fall semester. Mrs. Wright advised it was too late in the year for them to complete their full time slots and is currently in conversation with them to possibly change the full time slots to part time slots in order to prevent their funding from being cut. Mr. Craig shared every time they tweak their grant that it has to be re-approved. Commissioner Simms asked if it was reasonable to cut the 18 full time positions into 32 part time positions and recruit the appropriate number of people. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated as long as all of the paperwork was completed she didn't foresee a problem with them satisfying that requirement during the spring semester. She went on to say if it goes beyond the first week or two within the spring semester, then her response to Commissioner Simms question would be no. This is typical of a large university, so this is not the only university the Corporation has seen with these kinds of issues. She concluded by stating she was not concerned their funding will be pulled and the OFBCI can make a strong enough argument on their behalf. Commissioner Perry made a motion to approve the two competitive continuation grants. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Simms to approve Indiana Mentor Corps/Indiana Juvenile Justice Task Force—Aftercare for Indiana through Mentoring and Indiana University/Indiana Campus Compact. The motion passed, 9-0-1 with Commissioner McCracken not present for the vote.

Commission Chair Reingold suggested the Commission take a lunch break. Meeting adjourned from 12 noon to 12:20 PM.

While those in attendance were finishing their lunches, Commission Chair Reingold reconvened the meeting. He began discussion for the four new applicants, **Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County Indiana, Inc.; Concord Neighborhood Center; Project Impact Indianapolis, Inc.; and Indiana 211 Partnership, Inc.** He indicated two decisions would be needed reference the applicants. The first decision is whether or not it would be useful to the Commission to have members of the OFBCI staff conduct a pre-award risk assessment on each of them and the second decision is whether any of them should be considered for the competitive round. He proposed addressing each of these applicants within the context of those two questions. He asked if there were any objections, none noted.

Commissioner Adam Shoemaker requested to abstain from the upcoming voting process as he has a conflict of interest with one of the proposals.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers stated each proposal will be discussed to determine whether or not it should be removed from funding consideration. If the grant proposal is not discarded,

then the Commission can make a second motion if they wish to have it sent to the competitive round. However, none of the proposals received a recommendation from the peer review committee to send competitively. She further stated a pre-award risk assessment will be completed on the proposals remaining if the Commission wants a proposal to move forward in the process. Commissioner Simms made reference to the average panel scores of those grantees in question, two scores were in the 70's and one had a 49.5. He stated he had previously been a peer reviewer and is aware of the scoring process. As such, he would be inclined to accept the peer review panel's recommendations. Ms. Parker-Sawyers stated in the case of **Indiana 211 Partnership, Inc.**, the OFBCI staff agrees 100% with the peer review.* (*The information shared at the ICCSV meeting was incorrect. The peer review recommendation was "Fund at the amount requested with contingencies, including that applicant institute a 3-month development period followed by 9 months of operating." The staff recommendation was "Do Not Fund."). She said their concept was a good idea; it just wasn't a strong enough proposal. She indicated from a staff perspective that their idea is almost identical to what the OFBCI has done for the last year in conjunction with the Department of Workforce Development and the Department of Correction in creating the SHARE Network. She further shared during the implementation of SHARE, which is a web-based information system, Indiana 211 was asked to collaborate at no cost to them. Their response was no thank you. She stated this was possibly a back door way of replicating the same system already being put into place.** (**The information shared at the ICCSV meeting was incorrect. The program proposed by the Indiana 211 Partnership was to create a "give help" component to the 211 service, in addition to the "get help" component currently in existence. The SHARE Network currently contains web-based resources to help people find a job, keep a job, or obtain a better job—"get help" resources). Ms. Anderson provided comments for the Commission to consider. Indiana 211 Partnership, Inc., provided a detailed training/professional development plan which consisted of a lot of opportunities, but AmeriCorps training needs to be included. However, one of the reviewers commented they needed to see a plan for ensuring compliance with regulations at host sites. They did a good job describing what organizations are involved in their history, but didn't see a monitoring plan, which is essential to the implementation of a multi-site program, especially a statewide one. The peer reviewers noted that there was a lot of missing information in most of the categories. It includes some information relative to match sources-but no clear explanation of non-Corporation sources other than "other philanthropic funding." Ms. Parker-Sawyers then asked the Commissioners if any of them had any other concerns, if they would like to have the staff conduct a pre-award risk assessment or discard the proposal. Commissioner Perry asked if this grantee will receive feedback as to their proposal. Ms. Parker-Sawyers answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Perry indicated the proposal from Indiana 211 Partnership, Inc., was weak and should be dismissed. Motion seconded by Commissioner Simms and passed 8-0-2.

The proposal from the **Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County Indiana, Inc.** was then discussed. Mrs. Wright addressed the weaknesses and concerns the OFBCI staff has shared. One primary concern is possible displacement issue. The proposal is to host 75 members at 75 different sites, which is a massive undertaking as far as management oversight, as well as their request for a significant amount of money. Some of the sites

currently have members through AmeriCorps*National Direct through the Boys & Girls Clubs and some sites are currently funded through Boys & Girls Club of Indianapolis. The second issue has to do with the fact Boys & Girls Club of Wayne County is proposing to serve as the fiscal agent and proposed to work with the Indiana Alliance of Boys and Girls Clubs, which is a 501(c)4 and is not allowed per the Federal regulations. The proposal did not address what the formal relationship would be between Wayne County and the Alliance, but it appears there would have to be some sort of sub-contracting arrangement. The applicant is proposing to serve 25,000 students in one year, which is an incredibly large number of children. The peer reviewers felt if this proposal was scaled back and piloted in the areas where there isn't currently a National Direct program, that it had merit because it was working on the achievement gap. Mrs. Wright further stated the proposal was well written. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated since this application wasn't suggested to be sent competitively and at the direction of the ICCSV, a pre-award risk assessment could be conducted and with some tweaking, this proposal could become more focused. Commissioner Perry asked how the members of this program compare with the others, the national direct and also Boys & Girls Club of Indianapolis. Mrs. Wright stated they are similar to the other programs. Commissioner McCarthy asked if the staff has a recommendation as to what a reasonable number of participants should be. Mrs. Wright's response was no, however their proposal averages out to approximately 350 kids per member, and seems unrealistic. Commissioner McCracken asked if they were aware they couldn't apply as a 501(c)4. Mrs. Wright indicated they were aware they could not apply and it appears that because of that, Boys & Girls Clubs of Wayne County submitted the application. Commission Chair Reingold asked the Commissioners if they would like to keep this proposal in contention. Commissioner Perry asked if a risk assessment should be conducted. Commissioner McCarthy asked Mrs. Parker-Sawyers if this grant proposal had the ability to be tweaked. She indicated there were some programmatic and fiscal agent questions that would need to be determined during a pre-award risk assessment. Commissioner Perry made a motion to move forward and allow the OFBCI to conduct a pre-award risk assessment. Commissioner Butler seconded the motion. The motion carried 8-0-2. Commission Chair Reingold asked if any Commissioners had a desire to consider this application for competitive. They all responded no.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers then directed the Commission's attention to the program summary for **Concord Neighborhood Center**. She reminded the Commission of their decision last year to fund Red Cross of St. Joseph County, because of geographic disbursement issues, instead of Concord Neighborhood Center. Subsequently, they have resubmitted a proposal again this year. Mrs. Wright indicated this grant was poorly written, lacked details, and did not explain exactly what they planned to do. As staff, it was hard to justify how to move this application forward because there wasn't a good understanding of what exactly was being proposed. The peer reviewers expressed a need for this program but also noticed their proposal had holes. Commissioner McCracken asked if it was the same proposal that was submitted last year. Mrs. Wright indicated she believed they tried to update that proposal but didn't catch everything that needed updating. The peer reviewers felt there was a strong need for this program in their community. Commissioner Perry expressed concern regarding funding a neighborhood center.

Commission Chair Reingold asked the Commission if the OFBCI staff should be asked to do a pre-award risk assessment. Commissioner Perry moved to reject this grant proposal. Commissioner Munson seconded, the motion carried 8-0-2.

The next grantee to discuss was **Project Impact Indianapolis, Inc.** Before the discussion began, Ms. Parker-Sawyers advised the Commission that this year Habitat for Humanity is the only faith-based organization grantee. Their current three year funding cycle ends this year. Therefore, the Commission should have before them a recompetitve application for Habitat for Humanity of Indiana, which is Indiana HabiCorps. However, they do not. This grantee was eligible for funding but did not get their grant in on time. She indicated not only did they not get their grant in on time, their notification to the OFBCI their grant was going to be late did not come in on time either. Apparently there were problems with the eGrants electronic submittal. When they were given an opportunity to clarify the matter they didn't. Concord Neighborhood Center also encountered eGrant problems but were still able to comply with the requirements by submitting the application in hard copy before the deadline. The Project Impact Indianapolis, Inc. applicant is a faith-based organization, and if approved it would replace the faith-based opening left by Habitat for Humanity. Project Impact is associated with the Light of the World Christian Church. They have been running this program for several years and are in the process of diversifying. They had originally met with Mrs. Johnson-Powell and Ms. Parker-Sawyers a little over a year ago when they began planning to submit an application. They were given all the information and after they started conducting their own research, decided they weren't ready last year to submit an application.

Due to a previously scheduled meeting, Commissioner Perry had to excuse himself from the meeting.

Ms. Anderson was then asked to discuss the review panel's scores and comments. One weakness mentioned by both the peer and staff reviewers was that 90% of the executive director's salary and benefits as match on the grant, which is too much time for the ED, unless roles of the day to day management were confused. The governance structure also seemed like it was all staff members. She further indicated some more details could have been provided which possibly resulted in why they received a low score by the review panel. Commission Chair Reingold asked if there were any other comments or concerns. Commissioner McCarthy said it seemed like a good proposal and asked if there was a program like this any where else. Ms. Parker-Sawyers indicated there may be programs like it, but her hope was that it would have been strong enough to be sent for competitive funding. It is primarily minority based and serves youth who are at risk and believes it is one of those programs that after 3 years could be submitted competitively. The weaknesses have been pointed out and would be discussed during a pre-award risk assessment. Commissioner McCracken directed the Commissioner's attention to the reviewers' comments. A number of the reviewers talked about its fit with AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps standards and addressed concerns as to whether or not it was their own tools used in orientation or through the AmeriCorps training process. There wasn't any mention of AmeriCorps training/supervision and the training section was confusing. Commissioner McCracken further stated a question raised for her was did this applicant

take an existing grant and over lay it. Mrs. Wright stated from OFBCI's perspective, it reflected Project Impact Indianapolis didn't have a good grasp on the AmeriCorps terminology, such as member and volunteer. The whole application is reflective of that. Commissioner Simms made a motion for the OFBCI staff to have additional dialogue with them and conduct a pre-award risk assessment. Commissioner McCarthy seconded the motion. This motion passed 6-0-2. Commission Chair Reingold asked if there was any sentiment to advance this proposal on for competitive funding. Those in attendance responded no.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if it would be possible to get more explanation of why Habitat for Humanity of Indiana failed to resubmit their grant application. Commission Chair Reingold asked if there were any other agenda items prior to discussion Habitat for Humanity.

Ms. Parker-Sawyers stated what occurred with Habitat for Humanity's proposal was a sad end to their journey. Six months ago, there was discussion as to whether it was going to close down before the end of their third year (the current program year) due to not having enough match money. This time last year, as the Commission was going through the review process, Habitat for Humanity didn't have an executive director. They were going to have their board serve in the capacity of executive director; there were a number of compliance issues, as well as a number of complaints from the AmeriCorps members. It was a very painful journey for them. The bottom line, the program director was released from her position for not getting the grant in on time. She had been home ill and apparently had not informed the board she was having difficulty. The OFBCI literally tried everything. We checked with the Corporation to see if eGrant problems would justify the late submission of their grant. The program director was advised to re-read the grant package and still did not submit hard copies. Ms. Parker-Sawyers advised because of the persona of Indiana HabiCorps and the fact it is well know, she double checked with the Governor's Office to make sure there would not be a problem as far as they were concerned. Their first question was whether or not they followed the same rules as everyone else. Because the response was no, they advised we had to apply the same rules to them as everyone else. Habitat for Humanity was advised by letter they could not advance in the process. They are seeing through the remainder of this year's program, are now submitting all of their reports and are working closely with the OFBCI to ensure their reports are submitted in a timely manner. She concluded by stating the OFBCI is sad about the events that transpired but there was not a way to allow them to continue in the process without destroying the integrity of our grant approval process.

Commissioner McCarthy thanked the OFBCI staff for the fine and meticulous job done with the proposals and indicated it made their jobs as Commissioners easier.

Commission Chair Reingold concluded this meeting by providing the dates of the next few ICCSV meetings. Those dates are February 7, 2008, April 10, 2008 and June 5, 2008. Ms. Wright indicated depending on when the competitive grants are due, the June 5th meeting might have to be changed.

Commissioner Simms made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Munson. Meeting adjourned at 1:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet Simpson
Administrative Assistant