

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN)
Subcommittee Meeting**

May 2, 2017

Draft Minutes

Meeting Location: Teleconferenced

Public Access Location: Department of Health and Human Services, Family Program Office Conference Room, 4126 Technology Way, Carson City NV 89706

Members Present

Laura Alison (Ali) Caliendo, Subcommittee Chair
Jeff Fontaine
Michele Howser
Mindie Lloyd
Candace Young-Richey

DHHS Staff Present

Cindy Smith, Chief, Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG), DHHS
Marci Mueller, Crystal Johnson, Julieta Mendoza, Pat Petrie, Gloria Sulhoff, OCPG

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions, and Roll Call

Ali Caliendo, Subcommittee Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:03 AM. Cindy Smith, OCPG Chief, conducted roll call; all subcommittee members were present on the call, confirming a quorum. Jeff Fontaine indicated that he needed to leave at 10:30 to attend a hearing at the Legislature. Ms. Caliendo opened the floor for public comment.

II. Public Comment

Amanda Kerr, Wells Family Resource Center, thanked the subcommittee and stated she was excited to be a part of process.

III. Discussion: SFY18-19 RFA Grant Applications

Introduction

Ms. Smith thanked the applicants for their submissions. Overall, the number of applications received was almost double that of the previous RFA cycle. The Department was excited to see many new applicants participating in the process, along with many innovative proposals. Parameters of the review process included:

- No interaction between applicants and evaluators; applications must stand on own merit. GMAC subcommittee members can pose questions to staff, but not to the applicants.
- Members are welcome to discuss each proposal, including scores and strengths and weaknesses, and this discussion may prompt some adjustment in scores.
- Remember to take into consideration the geographic areas served, and try to ensure services are provided throughout the state.

- Do not “cherry pick”; don’t skip over higher scoring applicants in order to fund lower scoring ones.
- Proposals are categorized by sub-program areas: crisis intervention, child self-protection training, and parent education and training. In order to fund more applicants, funding from CTF (Children’s Trust Fund) was supplemented with federal Title XX money, for a combined total of \$1.7 million. The Department has developed two funding scenarios for consideration; the first one funds applicants at their full funding request, from the top scoring proposal down until the money is exhausted. Option 2 funds those applicants scoring 80 or higher with a 10% reduction in their request, which allows the funding to go a little further. The subcommittee can suggest alternate funding options. A meeting handout listed the applicants and funding by sub-program area.

Explanation of Grant Solicitation Process and Review

Elena Espinoza, program manager for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (PCAN), discussed the areas of focus and the items addressed during the technical review.

- In crisis intervention, the Department was looking for proposals that address a critical need and include a model that connects families to additional services, with a 72 hour turnaround. Crisis Intervention speaks to tertiary prevention, when a family has experienced trauma or abuse.
- Child Self-Protection Training teaches children to recognize potential abusive situations.
- Parent Education programs provide classes that teach developmental milestones and appropriate discipline within the family setting. This RFA included a supplemental component, requiring participation in a two-year statewide family strengthening and prevention initiative. It also addressed best practices, and capacity building for the grantee.
- All three sub-areas asked whether parents are integrated into programming; whether the program or approach is evidence-based or evidence-informed; evaluation tools and how outcomes will be measured; and access issues, how the program addresses transportation issues and cultural competencies.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

- Candace Young-Richey stated that she is a contributor to The Rape Crisis Center. The subcommittee determined that did not constitute a conflict of interest.
- Minddie Lloyd stated that she is a co-founder of a nonprofit that partners with The Rape Crisis Center and East Valley Family Services. The partnership does not involve finances, only advocacy and services. She confirmed that the award determinations for these two agencies do not affect the nonprofit she is associated with. The subcommittee determined that as long as there was no financial gain, there was no conflict.
- Jeff Fontaine stated that he recused himself from scoring two of the applications: Churchill County and Clark County, which are members of the Nevada Association of Counties, where he serves as Executive Director. Because he did not score them, he felt he should not vote on those as part of the group. Ms. Smith indicated that a separate vote should be taken for those two applications.

Discussion and Review of Proposals

Michele Howser had some overall comments regarding the reviews. This RFA required better documentation of MOUs; going forward, she would like to require proposals to include specific citations to support the evidence, and standardization of an assessment tool to collect data. The move to evidence based practices requires evidence based surveys. Ms. Caliendo suggested that the RFA incorporate some language to ensure everyone is using the same definition of evidence based/informed, and confirm the programs have been fully vetted.

Ms. Howser commented on the funding options presented by the Department. She referred to decisions made in the previous grant award cycle, and felt that to be equitable, the group should use the same funding scenarios for all three sub-program areas. She liked the fact that Option 1 funds the best of the best, but felt Option 2 to be more equitable because it includes everyone who scored 80 and above to be funded with only a 10% reduction. Ms. Caliendo agreed that Option 2 would include a few more regions and would be more equitable.

Parenting Education

- The subcommittee held an extensive discussion regarding the provision of services in rural and frontier counties. A point of contention was whether the applicants were the only agencies providing these programs, or if there were other providers in these areas. Despite a lower score, applicants in underserved areas should be given consideration, particularly in the very frontier counties such as Humboldt, Lander, Nye and Pershing. Conversely, a low score may indicate that the program isn't where it needs to be, in which case the delivery of services won't result in the outcomes we are looking for. For the record, OCPG staff indicated there are FRCs that offer parenting classes in those areas, as well as other state funding that is directed toward the rurals for parenting and family support. The subcommittee asked that, in the future, staff provide a listing or map of programs being provided across the state prior to the application review process.
- If the subcommittee decides to fund lower scoring proposals in order to provide geographic coverage, all the applicants scoring higher would need to be included in order not to "cherry pick". This then decreases the amount of funding for high-scoring applicants, who may have asked for little in the first place.
- Ms. Howser felt that they needed to stay within the boundaries of the process that was given to them. In the future, the GMAC may decide to allocate funds geographically to provide necessary services, but that is not how the process is now. She was not in favor of cherry picking, or of funding lowering scoring applicants just because of their location, stating that even though our hearts take us elsewhere, until we change the process, we should work with the parameters we've been given. She asked Jeff Fontaine, as an experienced member, his thoughts on this discussion point. Mr. Fontaine stated this discussion always occurs, and most often the subcommittees and full GMAC ultimately decide to try and allocate geographically, based on the premise that all of the scored applications met the minimum threshold for funding. Beyond the scores, they have always given consideration to geographic coverage and made concessions for a lack of expertise in grant writing. There is always a need, but not always other services available. Of the three classifications of counties, urban, rural and frontier, his greatest concern was for the frontier counties.

- Ms. Smith stated that the GMAC has previously discussed allocating funds geographically; the topic is brought up when developing the RFA. Everyone is in agreement that the rurals need more services, but there is only so much money to go around. That is one reason for the focus on collaboration; if a higher scoring applicant could reach out to other agencies in underserved rural areas, they could help them expand so they could apply on their own next time. There is no easy way to slice and dice the funding; we have to look at the bigger picture and cover what we can, providing quality services for families.
- Mr. Fontaine commented that the same scoring standards are used for all applicants. He suggested it might be appropriate for the GMAC to consider scoring the rurals differently, among themselves. The expertise and resources are not out there, especially for collaboration; there is much less opportunity for collaboration.

Rounding up discussion, Ms. Howser stated they need to decide on a funding option. She asked if anyone had a third option; none were offered. Ms. Smith asked if anyone wanted to discuss any of the individual applications.

- Ms. Young-Richey asked about the two largest funding requests, from Boys Town and Washoe County FRC Coalition. Boys Town, currently funded at \$45,402, is requesting a big increase, and there was nothing in their proposal to qualify such a significant increase. She asked if the budgets they submitted had been analyzed, and whether the numbers can be justified by the outcomes. Elena Mendoza, PCAN grant manager, reviewed their past performance. Boys Town has exceeded their outcomes. Their “Common Sense” parenting program was developed in-house and has expanded to other agencies. They are current this quarter, and in the past exceeded their goals. Washoe County FRC also exceeded their outcomes. Their uniqueness is they are fully embedded in the school district and have a built-in clientele base, which contributes to exceeding outcomes.

A calculation error was noted on the spreadsheet, under Funding Option 1 for Wells FRC parenting class. Their request was \$7,026, not \$184,299; this results in an additional \$177,000 available and would allow full funding for the Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows, with the remainder available to fund Tahoe SAFE Alliance. Pat Petrie, OCPG staff, noted that the Option 1 funding for Boys Town, \$130,725, was reduced from their request of \$172,905 because that’s all that was left.

- Mr. Fontaine noted that even in the rurals, there appeared to be some geographic overlap in services. Particularly for the rurals, shouldn’t we look at providing at least some service in the rurals, and maybe talk to some grantees about expanding their service area. For instance, the proposal from BOR serves predominately Clark, with some service in the northern rurals. Would it make sense to ask them, given the quantity of service providers, to consider adjusting or expanding their service areas to include rural areas particularly in south, and focus on those instead of areas with more service providers it looks like we are going to fund. Ms. Caliendo thought that was a good idea but didn’t think it could be accomplished during this meeting. Ms. Smith added that would be going outside the set parameters of this RFA, but that doesn’t mean we can’t ask them to go into the rurals and identify collaborations and duplication of services. That can be a directive point of conversation.
- Mr. Fontaine also suggested the possibility of awarding grantees additional, residual funding that may become available for the purpose of expanding services in the rurals. That was done during the last grant cycle to expand the hunger one-stop shop program to areas that were not originally funded. Ms. Smith indicated that could be done. Ms. Howser stated she would support

that, but it would not be fair to the applicants to disrupt the process at this point. Applicants were scored using the information and parameters that were provided. Last time each subcommittee did things differently and that did not work out; some were happy, some were not, and it disrupted the community. To change the parameters now would not be a fair and equitable process.

- Ms. Howser asked if the GMAC Wellness Subcommittee, which met May 1, allocated geographically. Ms. Smith explained they had an easier time because of the number of applications received and the amount of funding requested by each. They decided based on the options provided on the spreadsheet, and chose Option 2, which allowed funding all six applicants at a 23% reduced rate, and provided statewide coverage. All proposals scored very high, within 15 points of each other, and because there was no natural cut off point, all were funded at the same percentage.

Wrapping up the discussion, Ms. Caliendo asked if the members had any further discussion items or were ready to decide on a funding option. Minddie Lloyd suggested they move forward. All of the subcommittee members were in agreement with the funding awards as presented in Option 2. Ms. Smith noted this option leaves \$3,672 unallocated; the group can decide to add this amount to another agency, keep it for a special project, or for another purpose they may decide on.

Ms. Smith, acknowledging the difficulty of the decision, thanked the members for their concerns to ensure services are available across the state. The average scores were very close. If we could fund everyone, we would, but there is only so much money. That doesn't mean we can't work on the process, and work with awardees to collaborate and expand services to meet the gaps in services in the frontier counties.

Adjustment of Scores – None

IV. Action Item: Grant Award Recommendations

Ms. Smith recommended that the subcommittee vote separately on each sub-category of services.

Child Self-Protection Training

There was no discussion regarding the Child-Self Protection Training grant applications.

- Michele Howser motioned to recommend funding the Child-Self Protection Training applicants as follows, under Funding Option 2 as shown on the handout (Attachment A), covering Mineral County, Washoe County and Clark County: UNR Cooperative Extension, Mineral County; Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County; and The Rape Crisis Center. The motion was seconded by Ali Caliendo. There being no further discussion, a vote was taken and the motion carried unopposed with no abstentions.

Crisis Intervention

- Mr. Fontaine had the same concerns regarding the lack of funding in the frontier counties. He explained that he spent some time working with DHHS on the "No Wrong Door" service delivery model and wondered if an agenda item could be included for a future GMAC meeting to talk about that project and see if anything recommended in that project could help these applicants be more competitive.

- Ms. Young-Richey commented that Boys Town's in-home program is a national model, but they're also very expensive, to the detriment of Humboldt, Lander, and Pershing. Ms. Howser noted that Crisis Intervention programs require staffing at a high skill level, typically requiring a college degree and a higher level of staff performance. They are tougher to manage because of the 72 hour response time, requiring on call support for immediate intervention. Not everyone has the ability to staff at that level.
- Ms. Caliendo, commenting on how important crisis intervention is, wondered if a higher percentage of funding could be allocated to crisis intervention instead of doubling up on parenting training programs in Clark, for example. She would prefer to see crisis intervention offered in some unfunded counties rather than duplicative parenting classes in Clark. Ms. Young-Richey agreed.
- Ms. Caliendo also suggested, for future RFA processes, that the GMAC consider capping the number of requests in order to prioritize what's most important. Parenting classes are great, but as a state maybe we can prioritize to make sure we have crisis intervention programs. Ms. Young-Richey noted that the FRCs and subsequent Family to Family Program and Infant Support Districts (ISDs) were developed for this purpose. Ms. Smith stated that the OCPG would appreciate feedback, and invited them to sit on the committees as they look at parenting models and develop them. Ms. Caliendo commented that as she researched the programs that the applicants are choosing, she found that some are more highly rated than others. In addition to evidence-based programs, we should be looking at those that are highly rated. Ms. Smith indicated that the OCPG is working on that through a federal partnership with FRIENDS.
- Ms. Howser suggested future GMAC policy considerations might also include putting a cap on the amount requested, in order to limit the huge increases from some of these organizations; and limiting the number of programs funded in any geographic location. Other states often do set a limit, funding only two or three, not twenty, that provide the same services.

Mr. Fontaine indicated he needed to leave the meeting. He appreciated the discussion and trusted the group to make the right decision based on their discussion. He added that the topic regarding geography is one the GMAC will want to talk about going forward, but agreed they need to respect process and follow the ground rules that are currently in place.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Caliendo called for a motion to approve the Crisis Intervention award recommendations.

- Michele Howser motioned to recommend funding awards to the Crisis Intervention applicants as shown in Funding Option 2 on the spreadsheet (Attachment A): Olive Crest, The Children's Cabinet, Boys Town, and Tahoe SAFE Alliance at option 2. The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliendo, who then called for any further discussion. There being none, the motion carried unopposed.

Parent Education

There was no discussion specific to these applications. Ms. Caliendo called for a motion to approve parent education funding awards.

- Michele Howser moved to recommend funding awards to the Parenting Education applicants as shown in Funding Option 2: Advocates to End Domestic Crisis, FRC of Northeastern Nevada, Clark County Department of Family Services, The Children's Cabinet, Washoe County School

District FRC Coalition, Wells FRC, Ron Wood FRC, UNR Cooperative Extension, UNLV Prevent Child Abuse Nevada, Boy's Town, Boys and Girls Club of Truckee Meadows. The motion was seconded by Ali Caliendo. There being no further discussion, the motion carried unopposed. It was previously noted that Jeff Fontaine, who had already left the meeting, was recused from voting on the two County applications within this program area.

It was brought to the attention of the subcommittee that the spreadsheet contained a computation error in the Option 2 funding recommendation for Mineral County's Child Self-Protection Training program. The Chair called for a break at 10:40 AM in order to confirm the figures.

The meeting reconvened at 10:50 AM. Ms. Smith confirmed that the only error on the spreadsheet was the one pointed out for Mineral County's Child Self Protection Training proposal, which leaves us overallocated by \$4,713. In the past, this has been corrected by deducting the overage amount from the lowest scoring awardee, or you can come up with a different solution. Ms. Howser agreed that seemed the most equitable solution, and requested a re-vote for CSPT awards. Ms. Smith confirmed the corrected award amount for Rape Crisis Center is now \$54,961. With all subcommittee members except Jeff Fontaine present on the call, a quorum was confirmed, and Ms. Caliendo called for a motion to approve the revised awards for Child Self Protection Training.

- Michele Howser moved to amend the original motion under Child Self Protection Training to reflect the correction to the funding award for Mineral County Cooperative Extension, to be funded at the full 10% reduction formula in Option 2, along with Child Assault Prevention Project, and the Rape Crisis Center receiving the balance of available funding. The motion was seconded by Ms. Caliendo. There was no further discussion and the motion carried opposed.

V. Announcements

Ms. Smith will revise the spreadsheet to correct the error. The revised document will be distributed when the PCAN Subcommittee presents its recommendations to the full GMAC on May 25.

VI. Public Comment

None

VII. Adjournment

Having concluded all business, Ms. Caliendo thanked the participants and adjourned the meeting at 11:00 AM.

**SFY18-19
Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Proposals
Ranked by Average GMAC Score**

Parent Education Geographic Service Area	Organization Name	Project Title	FY17 Grant Amount (if any)	FY18 Request Amount	AVG GMAC Score	Option 1 Full Funding until Available Amount Exhausted	Option 2 Fund 80+ with 10% Reductions
Rural (Carson and Storey Counties)	Advocates to End Domestic Violence	Positive Parenting Through Family Crisis	25,264	29,306	90.4	29,306	26,375
Rural (Elko County)	Family Resource Center of Northeast Nevada	Parent Training and Activities to Prevent Child Maltreatment	75,092	73,451	88.8	73,451	66,106
Clark County (Urban and Rural)	Clark County Department of Family Services	Parenting Project	77,837	96,660	87.5	96,660	86,994
Washoe County (Urban and Rural)	The Children's Cabinet, Inc.	Parenting Education	28,591	82,439	87.4	82,439	74,195
Washoe County (Urban and Rural)	Washoe County Family Resource Center Coalition	Washoe County School District Family Resource Center Parent Training Programs	146,426	169,341	87.2	169,341	152,407
Elko County	Wells Family Resource Center	Parenting Classes		7,026	85.4	184,229	6,323
Rural (Carson, Douglas, Lyon, Storey Counties)	Ron Wood Family Resource Center	Positive Action Parent/Family Training and Case Management.	70,382	70,372	83.8	70,372	63,335
Clark County (Predominantly Urban with some Rural)	UNR - Board of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education - Cooperative Extension	FY18-19 UNCE Partners in Parenting		83,080	82.6	83,080	74,772
Clark County (Predominantly Clark with some service in Washoe and Northern Rural)	UNLV - Board Of Regents Nevada System Of Higher Education	Prevent Child Abuse Nevada Community Outreach and Training	56,332	101,042	82.0	101,042	90,938
Clark County (Urban and Rural)	Boys Town Nevada, Inc.	Common Sense Parenting®	45,402	172,905	82.0	130,725	155,615
Washoe County (Reno/Sparks) and Lyon County (Fernley)	Boys & Girls Club Of Truckee Meadows	Strengthening Families Program (SFP)	65,628	105,578	81.2		95,020
							-
Clark County (Las Vegas South, West, East and Henderson)	Dignity Health (Saint Rose Dominican Hospital)	WIC Parent Training Project	42,839	48,071	77.8		
Churchill and Lyon Counties	Churchill County Social Services	Churchill and Lyon Parenting Initiative		143,625	75.3		
Rural (Lincoln County)	Family To Family Connection-Isd 9	Parenting the Love and Logic Way	25,689	32,207	75.6		
Carson City and Washoe County	Nevada Urban Indians	Victim Services and Family Support		73,516	74.2		
Esmeralda and Nye Counties	Nevada Outreach Training Organization-No To Abuse	Parenting and Education Training		61,188	72.8		
Clark County (Las Vegas Central and East, and Laughlin)	East Valley Family Services	Bears and Binkies, a positive parenting program.	26,499	30,135	70.2		
Washoe County	Ridge House	Celebrating Families Parenting Education and Training		25,000	63.0		
		TOTALS	685,981	1,404,942			

Crisis Intervention Geographic Service Area	Organization Name	Project Title	FY17 Grant Amount (if any)	FY18 Request Amount	AVG GMAC Score		
Clark County (Urban and Rural) and Southern Nye County	Olive Crest Foster Family Agency	Strong Families	210,676	184,229	85.6	184,229	165,806
Washoe County	The Children's Cabinet, Inc.	Safe Place	96,951	143,413	85.0	143,413	129,072
Clark County	Boys Town Nevada, Inc.	In-Home Family Services		384,511	83.4	384,511	346,060
Washoe County (Incline Village to Crystal Bay)	Tahoe SAFE Alliance	Tahoe SAFE Alliance Children's Program	36,734	44,375	80.6		39,938
Humboldt, Lander, Pershing Counties	The Family Support Center	No Wrong Door, Child and Family Support		132,057	70.0		
		TOTALS	344,361	888,585			

Child Self Protection Training Geographic Service Area	Organization Name	Project Title	FY17 Grant Amount (if any)	FY18 Request Amount	AVG GMAC Score		
Mineral County	BOR NSHE UNR Cooperative Extension Mine	Peacemaking Skill for Mineral Co for Little Kids		36,773	88.0	36,773	24,711
Washoe County (Reno/Sparks), Lyon and Storey Counties	Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County	Elementary Child Abuse Prevention Workshop	102,350	120,621	82.4		108,559
Clark County (Urban and Rural)	The Rape Crisis Center	KidSPACE Programs	40,000	66,304	80.4		59,674
		TOTALS	142,350	223,698		1,769,571	1,765,899

**SFY18-19
Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Proposals
Ranked by Average GMAC Score**

**SFY18-19
Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Proposals
Ranked by Average GMAC Score**

Amount Available = \$1,769,571

Option 1 - Full Funding by Score until Amount Available Exhausted	Amount	Percent
Clark County - Urban and Rural	980,247	55%
Washoe County - Urban and Rural	395,193	22%
Rural Counties	394,131	22%
Total	1,769,571	100%
Unallocated	36,773	

Option 2 - Fund 80+ With 10% Reduction	Amount	Percent
Clark County - Urban and Rural	979,858	55%
Washoe County - Urban and Rural	599,190	34%
Rural Counties	186,850	11%
Total	1,765,899	100%
Unallocated	3,672	