

**Department of Health and Human Services
Director's Office, Grants Management Unit**

**Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC)
GMAC Subcommittee Meeting – Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN)
April 21, 2015**

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Meeting Locations (Videoconferenced)

Department of Public and Behavioral Health
4150 Technology Way, Room 303, Carson City NV

Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD), Early Intervention Services
1020 Ruby Vista Drive, Suite 102, Elko NV

ADSD Early Intervention Services
3811 W Charleston, Suite 112, Las Vegas NV

Subcommittee Members Present (None Absent)

Ina Dorman
Pauline Salla
Jeff Zander

Others Present

Laurie Olson, Chief, Grants Management Unit (GMU)
Laura Adair, Toby Hyman, Rique Robb, Cindy Smith, and Gloria Sulhoff, DHHS-GMU
Sarah Beers, Clark County Department of Family Services
Joyce Buckingham, Ron Wood Family Resource Center
Lillian Dypold, Boys Town Nevada
Dianne Farkas, Family to Family Connection ISD-13
Jennifer Findlay, St. Rose Dominican
Alanna Fitzgerald and Brenda Hess, Washoe County School District Family Resource Centers
Elizabeth Kunz, Tahoe SAFE Alliance
Lisa Lee, Advocates to End Domestic Violence
Angela Phillips, Olive Crest
Aaron Sheets, Hopelink of Southern Nevada
Lauren Soulam, Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows
Kim Young, Children's Cabinet

I. Call to Order, Welcome and Announcements

Laurie Olson, Chief of the Grants Management Unit in the Department of Health and Human Services, Director's Office, introduced herself and called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM. Roll call was taken and a quorum was confirmed. During roll call, the subcommittee members disclosed their affiliations and potential conflicts of interest with the applicant organizations. Pauline Salla stated that she works with federal funds in the DCFS Community Juvenile Justice Programs and has no conflicts with any of the applicants. Jeff Zander, Superintendent of Schools in Elko, has no relationships with any of the

applicants. The Family Resource Center works with students in his District, but this does not present a personal conflict of interest. Ina Dorman, a semi-retired social worker teaching in higher education, has no conflicts of interest with any of the applicants.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Election of Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) Subcommittee Chair

Ms. Olson called for nominations for a Chair to lead the subcommittee. In addition to this responsibility, the Chair will report the subcommittee's recommendations to the full Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) at its meeting on May 14, 2015.

- Ina Dorman nominated Pauline Salla for the office of PCAN Subcommittee Chair. The nomination was seconded by Jeff Zander. Ms. Salla accepted the nomination, and with no further comments or discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Review of Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN) Proposals

A. Introduction of Recommendation Process

Ms. Olson reviewed the goals of the Request for Applications (RFA) to seek proposals from strong organizations that are mission-driven and goal oriented, with programs that address the mission and goals of the Department and service delivery models that address the whole individual. She pointed out differences in the RFA procedure from previous cycles, including a preliminary review of the applications by GMU staff, and the elimination of any interaction between applicants and evaluators during the review process. The subcommittee can ask questions of GMU staff, discuss score variances between members, and submit score adjustments. Any adjustments to scores will be used to recalculate the rankings of the proposals. Questions regarding scope of work may be directed to GMU staff to address during negotiations. She reminded the members that this was first and foremost a competitive process, with scores based on merit, not geography. They cannot skip over higher scoring applications to fund lower scoring applications for any reason, including geography; and any budget reductions must be based on a formula that takes scores into account, with no arbitrary or random budget cuts.

B. Discussion of Proposals

Subcommittee Chair Pauline Salla led a review of the grant applications as listed on the spreadsheet, which ranked the applications by average GMAC score, grouped by program areas. Comments and concerns regarding the following applicants were noted.

Parent Training Applicants:

- Advocates to End Domestic Crisis: No comments or concerns. High-scoring proposal.
- Clark County DFS: Application indicated collaborations, but no MOUs were provided.
- UNLV Prevent Child Abuse Nevada: Comment made concerning lack of collaborative partnerships. Ms. Olson clarified that was not a requirement of the PCAN applicants.
- The Children's Cabinet: No comments.
- Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows: Some outcomes were confusing; the subcommittee asked that they be clarified. When asked if this program duplicated services provided by Children's Cabinet, Rique Robb of the GMU replied that the need and the size of the area merit multiple programs.
- Boys Town Nevada: Outcome indicating a 100% response rate is unrealistic.

- East Valley Family Services: Good outcomes, achievable program.
- Washoe County FRC: No concerns; Ms. Salla commented positively on the staff cross-training component.
- Dignity Health (St. Rose Dominican): Strategic plan section sketchy; need more information.
- Family to Family Connection ISD-9: Outcomes could be stronger and more measurable, and a question why no GMAC funds were received in the past two years was raised. Toby Hyman of the GMU explained that two years ago the FRC applied for funding, but the executive director did not attend a mandatory meeting so the application was disqualified. Ms. Salla disclosed that this organization provides services to Juvenile Justice where she is employed, but she did not feel this presented a conflict of interest. Fellow subcommittee members concurred.
- FRIENDS Family Resource Center: No in-kind funding identified. Regarding outcomes, reporting on four out of 20 items on the Protective Factors Survey seems too low. Ms. Hyman clarified that four out of 20 is the national standard.
- Family Resource Centers of Northeastern Nevada: Ms. Olson clarified that the mileage rate included in this budget reflects the January federal rate increase from 56 cents to .575. No details were provided on the community coalition. GMU staff will get more information if this organization is recommended for funding. Application indicates nine different programs, yet this budget seeks to support 20% of the executive director's salary. Staff responded that cost allocations are reviewed and possible justification may be that other funding sources cover program costs only and not administrative expenses. Grantees are asked to track time, some use square footage as basis of allocations; there is some reasoning behind how they arrive at percentages.
- Salvation Army Clark County: No other funding sources identified.
- Ron Wood FRC: Ms. Salla found the outcomes confusing, but staff clarified that the Outcomes section of the proposal was intended to get a picture of how an agency uses outcomes overall. The Projections section (which was not scored) provided the actual outputs and outcomes for the services to be provided under this proposal.
- UNR Cooperative Extension: No mention of board oversight.
- Nevada Outreach Training Organization: Goal of 100% completing the survey is unrealistic. Strategic plan has not been updated since 2009.
- Family to Family Connection ISD-13: MOUs were missing; couldn't determine whether they had a strategic plan; outcomes not very strong.

Crisis Intervention Applicants:

- The Children's Cabinet: Indirect costs are higher than the maximum 8%. Ms. Olson explained federal requirement to accept federally-negotiated rates if federal funds are used to support the proposal.
- Tahoe SAFE Alliance: Question regarding the funding from California. Ms. Hyman responded that the agency is on the Nevada-California border, and receives funds from NV and CA. Her understanding is that Nevada funds are only used for Nevada clients. Ms. Robb, the organization's current grant manager, confirmed Ms. Hyman's statement. All MOUs cited in the application are with CA organizations. Are there MOUs with Nevada organizations? If funded, staff will get that information.
- Boys Town Nevada: Fundraising is low for such a large organization. Ms. Salla commented that she could not locate an MOU with this organization in her office at the Department of Juvenile Justice.

- Olive Crest: Strategic Plan covers a nine-year period. Not clear whether they are working with the mobile crisis unit. Cost per service is high, at \$2,000 per family for 150 families; funding covers mostly salaries. If recommended for funding, the GMU staff was directed to work on outcomes so they are reflective of the money awarded.
- Hopelink: No MOUs; outcomes unclear; budget confusing; questions regarding board of directors; question regarding the relationship with Whitney Elementary School. Ms. Hyman explained that the organization was asked to do financial case management for parents at the school. The school has funding but no way to provide case management. It is presumed that the school pays Hopelink for those services.

Child Self-Protection Training Applicants

- Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County: No comments; scored high.
- The Rape Crisis Center: No formal partnership agreement.

C. Adjustment of Scores

The subcommittee took a 20-minute break to allow time for Ms. Olson to receive any score adjustments and update the spreadsheets accordingly. Ms. Salla called the meeting back to order at 3:27 PM. Ms. Olson reported that there were no significant changes to the applicants' scores, and no ranking changes. Ron Wood FRC's average score increased by one point due to one adjustment by one subcommittee member.

V. GMAC Discussion of Funding Options

Ms. Olson reviewed the funding options spreadsheet that was made available at the meeting. She noted that the average score shown for The Children's Cabinet's Crisis Intervention proposal dropped from 100 to 95 when a missing score from one subcommittee member was entered just before the meeting began.

The three categories within PCAN were listed separately so as not to compete for the same funds. Available Title XX funds have already been apportioned so that each program area gets a little more than in the current biennium. Because of the short time frame in which the subcommittee has to develop recommendations, GMU staff ran some numbers in advance using various funding scenarios. Several approaches were considered; the three on the funding options spreadsheet were the best, but none are perfect.

- Option 1 funds the highest scoring applications at the amount requested until the money runs out. What is left can stay on the table or be awarded to the next highest scoring applicant.
- Option 2 attempts to bring in the next tier of proposals. To accomplish this, every program has to reduce its budget, sometimes severely. More programs are funded, but the reductions will require proportional cuts in the number of people served. A very low grant award may not be reasonable because administrative costs to manage the grant may outweigh the benefit.
- Option 3 attempts to establish standard award amounts based on scores. The amounts are not based on a formula, just what works in each category. A major flaw to this approach is that a lower scoring applicant requesting less than the standard amount may get fully funded while higher scoring applications requesting more than the standard amount would take a cut.

Ms. Olson stated that the document was provided as a tool to give the subcommittee an idea of what it would look like if they decided to take one of these approaches; they were not limited to these options. She reminded them that funding recommendations are to be based on merit, not geography; the

competitive process requires that the highest scoring proposals are funded. Also, no cherry picking, even to provide more equitable geographic distribution, and no arbitrary or random funding cuts.

The subcommittee discussed funding options for the Child Self-Protection Training (CSPT) proposals. There were only two applications, both scored above 90, and funds are available to fully fund both.

- Jeff Zander motioned to recommend full funding to both applicants in the CSPT category. The motion was seconded by Ina Dorman. Ms. Salla clarified that this recommendation is to fund the Rape Crisis Center at \$40,000 and Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County at \$102,350. There being no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

The subcommittee next discussed funding options for the Crisis Intervention applicants. They agreed that Option 2 would allow for more equitable distribution of funds.

- Jeff Zander motioned to recommend funding Option 2 for the Crisis Intervention proposals as shown on the funding spreadsheet. The motion was seconded by Ina Dorman. Ms. Olson recommended that the motion include instruction to staff to adjust the percentages to make the math work. Mr. Zander further moved that the percentages in Option 2 are to be updated by staff based on the scoring change affecting The Children's Cabinet. Ms. Salla clarified that all applicants except Hopelink will be funded; they include Boys Town, Olive Crest, The Children's Cabinet, and Tahoe SAFE Alliance. The motioned carried unopposed. Ms. Olson had meanwhile adjusted the percentages to 82.8% and 72.8% which changes the funding figures very little.

Regarding the Parent Training proposals, Ms. Olson confirmed that there were no ranking changes after Ron Wood FRC's average score was adjusted upward by one point. The funding pool included \$725,744 but requests totaled \$1,096,335. Funding Option 2 would not include proposals scoring below 80. Ms. Olson noted that 79.3 is not a bad score, but the issue is that there is not enough money to fund everyone. In discussing reduced funding, Ms. Olson stated that GMU staff will be adjusting outcomes during negotiations. After full discussion, the subcommittee members came to a consensus to recommend Option 2.

- Jeff Zander motioned to approve Option 2, funding applications scoring 90 or higher at 86.5% of the request (Advocates to End Domestic Violence, Clark County DFS, UNLV Prevent Child Abuse Nevada, The Children's Cabinet, Boys & Girls Club of Truckee Meadows, Boys Town, East Valley Family Services); and applications scoring 80 or higher at 76.5% of the request (Washoe County FRC Coalition, Dignity Health, Family to Family Connection ISD 9, FRIENDS FRC, FRC of Northeastern Nevada, The Salvation Army, Ron Wood FRC). Ina Dorman seconded the motion. Ms. Salla asked for confirmation that staff would be addressing all of the concerns previously identified by the subcommittee. Ms. Olson assured the committee that staff would follow up on all of them. There being no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed.

VI. Public Comment

None

VII. Adjournment

- Jeff Zander moved to adjourn. Ina Dorman seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:05 pm.