March 12, 2019

Members of the GMAC:

The intent of this letter is to address the March 4, 2019 GMAC Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Subcommittee (PCAN) work session and the resulting grant award recommendations. We believe the process that was followed has some significant flaws, and draw your attention to the following information listed below.

It appears that all proposals were reviewed by 2 of the 5 committee members resulting in a wide range of reviewer scores with significant variance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
<th>Reviewer 3</th>
<th>Reviewer 4</th>
<th>Reviewer 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Score</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Score</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reviewer 4’s highest score is lower than Reviewer 1’s lowest score.
- Those proposals that were reviewed by both Reviewer 3 and Reviewer 4 were at a great disadvantage in their “average” as they were reviewed by the two reviewers who consistently scored applicants lower.
- ALL of the top ranked applicants (top 9 that were being considered for funding) had Reviewer 1 and/or Reviewer 5 review their proposal.
- Averaging only two scores does not give every applicant the same opportunity to be scored by all scoring styles. An average should be used only IF all applicants are given the same review opportunity.

There is a significant variance in applicants’ two scores that were averaged to determine their chance at this funding opportunity:

- Variance ranged from a high of a 50 point variance between two scores to a variance of 0.
- 22 of the 33 applicants had a variance between their two scores of 10 points or greater.
Applications were not considered in the context of topic area as defined in the RFA – Parent Education and Training, Crisis Intervention and Child Self-Protection. In previous years, the PCAN subcommittee has worked from a funding recommendation sheet that included the breakdown into the three defined topic areas thereby ensuring that all three areas were funded. As one example, the method used this year has resulted in zero funding of Crisis Intervention services in Reno/Sparks (one crisis intervention program in Tahoe was funded.

We believe the process for funding decisions, specific to PCAN, should be reviewed, discussed and amended. Recommendations include:

- All reviewers should read and score every application with clear reviewer guidelines.
- All proposals should receive new averaged scores. Service type (Parenting, Crisis Intervention, Child Self-Protection) and geography should be considered so that it is ensured services are available across service type and geographically.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Kim Young

Kim Young
Executive Director
The Children’s Cabinet