

**Grants Management Advisory Committee**  
**Discussion Points Concerning SFY18-19 Request for Applications**  
**Department of Health and Human Services**  
**Office of Community Partnerships and Grants**

After the SFY16-17 Request for Applications (RFA) for the Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN), Children's Trust Fund (CTF) and Social Services Block Grant (SSBG/Title XX), follow-up surveys were distributed to members of the Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) and organizations that applied for funds. The primary purpose was to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the process, and staff will use the survey information to determine related improvements. However, responses also pointed out some policy areas that are appropriate for members of the GMAC to discuss and consider as possible recommendations to the Director of the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).

**Comments from survey respondents included the following policy areas.**

- Some high-scoring proposals received less funding than in prior years so lower-scoring proposals could be funded.
- Established agencies with prior funding that have achieved goals should receive more weight than new applicants.
- New programs should be given more weight.
- Larger requests resulted in larger awards without enough consideration. Suggest a cap on requests or set a maximum cost per unit served in each program category.
- Too much funding was awarded to State agencies.
- State and local governments are already funded for the services proposed; limits should be placed on these awards.

**Staff converted these comments into the following questions.**

- Should existing grantees receive bonus points for good performance (e.g., achieving goals, timely and accurate reporting, clean fiscal and program monitoring)? And, conversely, should points be deducted for poor performance?
- Should new or first-time programs receive special consideration of some kind (e.g., filling an unmet need)?
- Should the RFA establish award ceilings and/or award floors, or take a tiered approach to funding based on factors such as the number of clients to be served?
- Regulations associated with the funding streams does not exclude state or local governments from applying, but should limits be placed on awards made to public entities in order to ensure that a reasonable amount of funds is distributed to community organizations?

**Two other pertinent policy questions have surfaced in other discussions about future competitive solicitations.**

- Should the SFY18-19 RFA specify an amount available for the major geographical areas of the state (i.e., Clark County, Washoe County and Rural)?
- Should the GMAC subcommittees that evaluate proposals continue to convene around program areas or switch to a regional approach (again, Clark, Washoe and Rural)?