

**Tompkins County Youth Advisory Board
January 10, 2022, from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM
Hosted via Zoom**

Present: Patty Van de Bogart, Marie Kirchgessner, Leonardo Vargas Mendez, Pat Buechel, Lisa Monroe, Randy Smith, Khaki Wunderlich, Ian Schachner, Lisa Campbell, Jennifer Dean, Tamer Elshourbagy
Absent:

Staff: Kate Shanks-Booth, Theresa Albert, Bridgette Nugent, Meghan Lyons

Meeting called to order: 5:08 PM

Patty and Khaki's Reappointment to Board

- Patty asked some clarifying questions about the appointment of Khaki and herself to the Board.
- Theresa expressed concern that the normal procedure for reappointment was not followed by the County, and then asked some additional clarification questions about how Khaki and Patty were notified about their appointment.
- Khaki said that she had received her appointment letter, and that she had fill out the application a few months earlier. Patty said that she got the same letter and had also filled out her application.
- Theresa said she would follow up with the County to see what the changes in the process were about.
- Marnie moved to accept the reappointment of Khaki and Patty to the Board, and Patty seconded that motion. The vote passed unanimously.

Slate of 2022 Officers

- Pat said that an email had gone to the whole board asking for nominations for officers.
- Pat then said the following slate of officers for 2022 were proposed:
 - Patty for Chair
 - Khaki for Vice-Chair
 - Lisa M. for Secretary.
- Patty moved the slate of officers. Marnie was the second to that motion. The slate of officers as proposed by the nomination committee were passed unanimously.

Update on the Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) Request for Proposal (RFP)

- Patty reminded the Board that the RHY RFP was sent out in November, and that the Resource Allocation Committee (RAC) had reviewed two bids from the Learning Web and Family and Children's Services.
- Patty said that after conversation the RAC did not feel they could fund either of the bids in their current state, and they had asked Kate to go back with some additional clarification questions.
- Patty said they had agreed to give each applicant two weeks to revise their bid and then resubmit for the next review of the RAC.

- Kate provided an update to the RAC and the Board that she had already reached out to the Learning Web to have that discussion and it had gone well.
- Kate also said that she had reached out to Mike Ellis, and they had a discussion scheduled for the following day.
- Kate and Patty said that the bidders have two weeks to get the responses back to the RAC.
- Patty said given these clarification processes there was no official RAC recommendation tonight, but they would keep the Board updated on the process.
- Khaki wanted to make sure that both bidders were told that they had the option to redo their budgets. Kate assured her that she had let LW know that and would also let FCS know the next day.
- Khaki encouraged members of the board to get involved with the Resource Allocation Committee. She said that it was the best way for her to gain the knowledge of how the money flows into our department and how it is used in the County to fund programs for youth.
- Patty said that she would second what Khaki said, and it would be well worth the time.
- Pat followed up with a clarification question asking about the time commitment.
- Theresa responded that this year it would be more because it was a new process/cycle, but that it would be less during a renewal year. For example, she said that this year it would be several hours over the course of a month.
- Patty told Pat it was a very defined period and welcomed her to join if she would like to do so.
- Khaki said that she would like to see the whole board involved in the RFP discussion.
- Marnie said she thought that would be good, and she would like to see that that. She further suggested that maybe the board use our already scheduled meeting.
- Kate added that she said that conversation was already in flux, but if we did ask for additional help, we would try to ask the board during the regular meetings that are already scheduled.

The 2023 RFP Process

- Patty opened the conversation around the updates that were being suggested to the RFP per the prior board meeting discussions. She said that there were four areas that each member had been asked to look at, and she would like to go through those.
1. Introduction: Patty said that this introduction is completely different than it was in 2017. She stated the due to Covid they are looking for new and innovative ideas on how to address the changes in our world.
 - a. Pat said that she thought the introduction was good. She added that it addressed a lot of issues that have been talked about in prior meetings and seemed to address the six Touch Stones
 - b. Lisa Campbell said she thought the introduction was very clear.
 - c. Pat did note that youth employment issues had been talked about but were not addressed in the introductions. She wondered if maybe we wanted to add it? Khaki and Patty agreed that was a good point and pushed the question to the larger group.
 - d. Randy mentioned that Ian felt strongly about a classroom focus, and asked how he felt about this?

- e. Ian said that he thought the introduction was good He did question if it was clear to the applicants that they could focus on one or two of these things, not have to look at everything. Ian did ask if it was a work in progress? Patty said yes, and we were looking at the finer details as we move forward.
- f. Patty did say that we were not narrowing the Touch Stones.
- g. Randy was surprised by how much was required by the bidders for the money, noting that they only really get half of the money.
- h. Pat then asked if agencies could submit multiple applications? The answer was yes, we are open to multiple applications.
- i. Lisa Campbell said this introduction really gives a good opportunity for an organization to “toot” their horns a bit and really tell us what they are hoping to do. She said that there will be lots of overlap, and that’s not a bad thing, but to let them speak to how they specially address them.
- j. Randy asked, why we can’t say TCYSD has x amount of funding in any one of these areas, and then let them come at us with lots of ideas?
- k. Patty noted that we do need to narrow it down just a little bit.
- l. Kate also added that the areas of the Touch Stones are dictated by OCFS, and most of the agencies have already been doing work under certain Touch Stones for some time. The introduction was a chance for them to move beyond the copy and paste, and really let them brag about how they have been doing, and then how we can be supportive to them.
- m. Khaki reminded everyone that this is only part of the thing funded by youth services. She noted that just because we aren’t addressing things here, it doesn’t mean we aren’t supporting those areas in another way.
- n. Theresa circled back to Randy’s question, and noted that the Department did try to be more open in the RFP process before, but they found they were funding more agencies but at smaller amounts. She said that the Board made the decision that they wanted to focus larger sums of money in fewer areas to increase the impact that we could have. Randy said that explanation made sense.
- o. Lisa said that she thought that the Touch Stones were created as the results of a major reach out effort from the department in the past. Kate said that the Achieving Youth Results was what she was thinking about, noting that AYR was the community’s response to the Touch Stones from OCFS.
- p. Khaki asked that if we did add something for employment, what is the language that we wanted to add and where would we add?
- q. Kate reminded the board that historically we did share a position with the WDB, but that no longer lives with our Dept. However, this was County/State funds that do go there.
- r. Kate said that in addition, we do help fund through MYSS some employment through RYS.
- s. Marnie added that we currently fund the IYB’s Youth Employment Services, as well as the Learning Web via Career Exploration.
- t. Khaki came back to the question about asking if we wanted it to be an area of focus in the introduction? Pat said since we fund a lot, maybe that was enough?

- u. Lisa Campbell said that we could add it to the areas of focus a little later, the funding opportunities would be a good place to put it, and everyone agreed.
2. Target Population section of the RFP – Page 10 – 11
- a. Patty said that this is very similar to the 2017 RFP section. She wanted to know if anyone thought we needed to add anything to it?
 - b. Randy asked if the age group here was 0 – 24 years. Kate said yes, that is the age range that we serve. Randy said he thought that this section was good.
 - c. Ian asked why we were asking the applicants to tell us why they are selecting this target population? Ian wanted to know how the bidder reached their conclusion of the numbers they expect to serve.
 - d. Kate said that maybe what he was asking about was that applicants flush out the number of young people serve, not why they selected the target population? Kate noted that if they have been funded previously the numbers, they provided should be consistent with the numbers reported in the prior year. But it was a new question for newly funded agencies, and they could elaborate on it more.
 - e. Khaki said that there should be some thought that goes into the process of how many youths they will serve.
 - f. Marnie said that it is still problematic given her prior experience with filling out applications for funding.
 - g. Khaki asked if we have differentiated direct and indirect services. Kate noted that it is all direct service, and the department has done a good job on flushing out the differences in the youth served under those categories.
 - h. Bridgette was asked if she agreed, she wanted to know if it was looking at research, etc., it could be tracked better. And that would not be an issue.
 - i. Jenn Dean joined the meeting at this time and was asked if she had any feedback, she said that she has none right now.
 - j. Tamer asked us to elaborate on the point system that is mentioned in the RFP. Kate said that it was tied to a rubric that was given to the RAC. Tamer asked if it was provided to the applicants prior to their submission?
 - k. Khaki said it helps her when she applies. Patty said it was an interesting question.
 - l. Ian asked about if/how feedback is gathered from community partners? Kate asked if there is anyone who has been through the process before, that might like to elaborate on the issue?
 - m. Theresa said we don't always ask the feedback, but the applicants do often give it to us. Ian wanted to see a place for interesting takeaways from the process to be noted.
 - n. Kate said that community members will be added to the RAC process. Khaki said that she has never really using the point system, but it looks like the system is based on the number of pages provided.
 - o. Pat said performance accountability would be measured very heavily, and she would focus there. What are their measures? How do they plan to do that?

- p. Kate reminded everyone that the way the agencies measure success is tied to the AYR. She said that it is something that we could talk about in the weekly meetings and bring that back to the larger board.
- q. Khaki said she likes page limits, but they are putting those into the one system and that may not give page numbers. Kate said that we are using the Bidnet system, which does include pasting word documents into it. Thus, page numbers are accurate.
- r. Lisa asked if we can go back to the bidder after they submitted for follow up questions? Theresa said that we can follow up with the agency.
- s. Lisa asked if the follow up with the agencies was common? Theresa said that we have done this a couple ways over the years, where we would have every applicant come in to meet with the RAC. However, she said that was changed because the RAC felt that someone might be wonderful in person in personality, and could sway a decision. So, to make it fair it was no longer done in person, and we have gone back for clarification questions and that is not that much more work.
- t. Marnie asked if the submission have to be done online now, and Kate said yes, we are now having to go through the Bidnet process and they are submitted online.
- u. Tamer asked if any point in the process, we are going to have the applicants come in and talk to us in person? Patty said that it was done for the RAC, not the full board
- v. Patty asked if that was something we wanted to do? Tamer said that it would be nice to put a face to the application and hear from them.
- w. Theresa said that the timing of all this was the issue because the County Budget timeline is tight between when applications come in and when we must make decisions. She felt it was not possible to have all the applicants come in .
- x. Tamer asked how many we are expecting? Theresa said last time we had 26 enter the process, 13/14 went on to the next round, and then 9 were funded.
- y. Khaki said she would want some specific reason to ask them to come in. She noted that having applicants come in person allows implicit bias to sneak in.
- z. Kate said that she thinks Tamer said is valid, but the truth is that we have difficulty making quorum on a regular basis, and it is a matter of the actual board capacity to set those up and make them meaningful would be. She did not support having applicants come into an in-person meeting.
- aa. Patty asked for anything additional, and she loved the conversation that we were having with the full board.

3. Program description and Details: Pages 11-12

- a. Patty asked us to look at this and opened the floor for discussion on this area.
- b. Patty said we did include a request for program changes that are resulting due to Covid.
- c. Kate said we added how the applicants were going to be accessible to those who have disabilities?
- d. Khaki said we are looking at changes the applicants have made in response to Covid, but also how they will continue to be flexible in the future.
- e. Lisa Campbell, said that is good to ask that question.

- f. Word change was suggested from “Not currently funded” to “new programs” can – Khaki noted this suggestion in the question section.
 - g. Jen said, the “programs not currently operating”, not exactly “new programs”.
 - h. Patty said that was a good point.
 - i. Khaki also suggested changes to the phrasing around asking applicants to outline the action they will take to help outreach, retention, and sustainability for the new programs.
- Kate said that we would take this feedback and provide an updated version for the next board meeting.
 - Kate said we would continue to discuss the need for a pre-application process or just move to the full application.

End of the Year Report

- Lisa Campbell – said that each year she goes to the Town of Lansing and reports out to them about the items that the Youth Advisory Board does. She said that it is so uplifting, and this year was such a rough year, it was wonderful to be able to go back and look at all the great things that we have done.
- She asked that next year everyone reach out to her and tell her what meant the most to the members, or what they are most proud of. Lisa said that it does fall into our goals to work on the relationships with those municipalities, and it is a really easy way to do that.
- Patty asked if Lisa would be willing to share that with each of us. She added that it is wonderful to take stock of the good things that we have done.
- Lisa said she would like to encourage the board members to make their own. She said she would be happy to share highlights but didn’t want to send the whole thing.
- Patty asked if Marnie does something for Danby? Marnie said she typically goes in person and that she always ties it back to the funding.
- Patty also said that Glen Morey has stepped off the Board due to the end of his term on the Tompkins County Legislature, but Patty was going to ask him to consider him joining as an At-large member.

2022 Board Retreat

- Patty said she hopes that we can do it in person.
- Patty asked the group to think about the goals, and what we want to accomplish. She said the new RFP but asked if there was anything specifically, they had been talking about.
- Kate reminded the board that the goals in prior years were on their agenda.
- Lisa said that one of the best things our department does is share information with the Board, and it was awesome to look back and learn from all the information that was sent. That’s great because the education part was a huge piece of the education of the Board.
- Ian asked for clarification on what the point was for the conversation around the goals.
- Kate said that this is the introduction conversation. The existing goals were set in 2020 and we moved them to 2021, and really this was just the start of the conversation about the goals.
- Pat asked how people feel about the goals, and have we achieved them?

- Patty said we are doing a better job of getting information to the board, and there is more work to be done, but we have done good stuff.
- Lisa C. said that we have done a really good job at building new relationships with the Commissions/Community Council – example was using the vitality checklist. She said her biggest issue was recruitment and we are limited.
- Kate noted that as she looked back over the last two years a lot of good things that have been done. Progress has been made on all the goals.
- Ian said that agencies are offering a huge amount of money, are having trouble getting people to show up. He said that volunteer recruitment will continue to be an issue.
- Pat said that she was curious if the board members had attended the Commission/Council meetings, she asked if that was happening. Patty said that yes, we have been attending meetings.
- Kate said that it's a lot easier via Zoom, and maybe we need to have some work done around expectations of Board members at these meetings.
- Meghan said she would connect with Pat about getting her to attend a meeting.
- Ian commended on the idea of the goal, having a debrief for a community look like? What are the lessons learned about partnerships, streamlining of process, uses of technology?
- Kate said that this is exactly what we might use part of the upcoming MYSS event that is happening in the Spring.
- Khaki pointed out that the next meeting is on the Feb. 28, 2022, at 5:00 pm.

Meeting was called at 6:38 PM.

Submitted by Kate Shanks-Booth