Summary of Responses to GMAC Survey
SFY16-17 Request for Applications Process

- Seven GMAC members responded including at least two from each subcommittee.

- Seven strongly agreed or agreed that the RFA clearly explained the available funding, the purpose of the funding, and the kind of programs that could be funded.

- Six strongly agreed or agreed (and one was neutral) that the questions in the application were clear and easy to understand.

- Five strongly agreed or agreed (and two were neutral) that the questions in the application targeted the most important information about the organizations that applied and the programs they proposed.

- Seven strongly agreed or agreed that the space allowance for responses was about right.

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that the initial screening by GMU staff and the pass/fail step was a useful tool. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that GMU staff comments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each application were helpful in their individual evaluation of the applications. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that GMU instructions about the GMAC's role in reviewing the applications helped them understand and perform their task. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that sufficient time was allowed for GMAC members to individually review the applications. (One did not respond.)

- One strongly agreed, three were neutral and one disagreed that shortening the time allowed for GMAC members to individually review the applications by one week would be acceptable. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that member and staff discussion at GMAC subcommittee meetings was helpful in coming to agreement on award recommendations. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that the possible funding options provided to the subcommittees by the GMU staff (e.g., full funding for top scoring applications, reduced funding based on scores) were reasonable and helpful. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that the requirement that proposals stand on their own merit contributed to a fair and equitable outcome. (One did not respond.)

- Five strongly agreed or agreed and one strongly disagreed that the next application process should include a way for evaluator questions to be answered before award recommendations are made. (One did not respond.)

- Six strongly agreed or agreed that sufficient time was allowed at the GMAC subcommittee meetings for discussion and adoption of recommendations. (One did not respond.)

- One strongly agreed, three agreed and two were neutral that the structure of the full GMAC meeting allowed sufficient opportunity and time for members to hear, consider and act on the subcommittee recommendations. (One did not respond.)

- Three strongly agreed and three agreed that final funding decisions made by the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services were respectful of the competitive process. (One did not respond.)

Comments Related to Clarity of Application Questions

- Responses to question about collaboration were diverse. Question needs clarification.

- Language about outcomes and outcome measures needs to be more instructional.

- Ask why applicants are responding to Request for Applications and how their services directly relate to the stated need.

- Emphasize that current strategic plans are important.

- Edit questions to eliminate duplication of content.

- Request a short narrative explaining the budget.

General Comments

- Great job with intake and processing, and with providing information to subcommittee.

- Consider how and when to provide information to committee about background of prior funding, shifting or combining proposals.

- Rubric (aka scoring matrix) aided in consistent scoring. Applicants realize the scores represent a variety of viewpoints.

- Process works well. Don't reduce the time.