

Department of Health and Human Services, Director's Office – Grants Management Unit
SFY2016-2017 Problem Gambling RFA

Questions and Answers Updated 3/10/15

Q: Can we get a copy of the orientation presentation slides?

A: Yes, the presentation will be posted to the GMU website.

Q: I would like a list of all the attendants at today's meeting, thank you.

A: Information on webinar attendees is considered confidential.

Q: For your convenience and to pass along an announcement at the recent ACPG meeting, is there a way you'd like us to request past years' feedback on previous grant applications we have been involved in?

A: If you want information on past years' applications, send an email to Pat Petrie at PDPetrie@dhhs.nv.gov requesting what you're looking for and he will get it to you, whether it be comments, score, or whatever.

Q: Is the financial statement we are required to submit for Jan-Dec or July-June of 2014?

A: If your fiscal year is based on the calendar year, it will be January-December. If your fiscal year is the same as the State's, it will be July-June. We are asking for your most recent financial statement or audit. Whatever your most recent audit or financial statement is, that's what we want to see.

Q: The RFA states the purpose is intended to solicit proposals that will build from existing efforts and infrastructures.... "(c) develop partnerships and collaborative projects with organizations where addressing Problem Gambling is consistent with meeting their mission." My question is this: Does the above statement mean you are looking for agencies that are already doing Problem Gambling prevention to collaborate, or would a new collaborative effort to prevent problem gambling be consistent with the type of proposals you are seeking?

A: The RFA for problem gambling prevention services does not exclude organizations from applying who do not currently offer problem gambling prevention services. As stated with the RFA, resulting grants must include some or all of the following objectives:

- integrate the topic of problem gambling into existing health promotion programs;
- expand current problem gambling prevention efforts;
- develop partnerships and collaborative projects with organizations where addressing problem gambling is consistent with meeting their mission;

- initiate and coordinate statewide efforts in recognition with Problem Gambling Awareness Month;
- mobilize grass root efforts to harness the energy of persons in recovery or other concerned citizens to address problem gambling prevention via public awareness, education, and policy initiatives, and
- build systems and supports to keep prevention initiatives in place well beyond the grant funding period.

Q: We may be interested in applying for a prevention grant, but the RFA asks us to work with existing agencies already addressing problem gambling. Will it be possible for you to let us know who in Elko County is doing treatment for gambling addiction?

A: As stated above you don't have to work with an agency already providing problem gambling services; however, we would like your program to build on an existing infrastructure. For example, you can integrate the topic of problem gambling into an existing health promotion program. If you would like to collaborate with an agency already addressing problem gambling, I would suggest you search the internet or use other resources to see what programs are available in your area.

Q: The RFA indicates that ACPG members will be excused from Step Three of the evaluation process. That implies that members cannot discuss proposals during the May 21, 2015, meeting of the ACPG. Is this correct?

A: No. The RFA should have stated that ACPG members with a conflict of interest (i.e., members who have applied for funding or have an affiliation with an applicant agency) will be excused from voting during Step Three of the process.

Q: I am applying on behalf of the Partnership for Research, Assessment, Counseling, Therapy and Innovative Clinical Education (the PRACTICE), which is a non-profit mental health training facility at UNLV. The tax ID links to the Board of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education, given the PRACTICE does not have its own unique tax ID. Given that the PRACTICE is under the umbrella of UNLV, which is under the umbrella of the Board of Regents Nevada System of Higher Education, I am not sure what is correct for the contact categories on pages 1 and 2 of the application.

A: I suggest you use the following:

1. The primary organization should be the Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV). In our past experience with UNLV and UNR, all grants have to be issued to the university, not to the program actually applying for the grant. Likewise, use the university's tax ID number.
2. In the box labeled "Also Known As," I would suggest entering the actual name of your program to distinguish it from other university programs that may be applying for grants under this or other RFAs.
3. Address, phone, fax, and other contact information should be information specific to the PRACTICE.
4. Primary contact information needs to be the members of the PRACTICE staff.

Q: I am assisting a faculty member at UNLV prepare a proposal for the SFY16-17 Problem Gambling Workforce Development RFA and we came across a question. The RFA instructs applicants to submit a **Current list of Board of Directors or Other Governing Board (if applicable) including affiliations and terms of office.**

- How do we determine if our proposal needs to submit this information? We are unclear on the RFA's guidance that "some are required while others are optional depending on the content of the proposal"
- If required, would affiliation be defined as current professional job? Our governing body is the NSHA Board of Regents.

A: University applicants should submit information about the current Board of Regents. For the "affiliation" requirement, it would be appropriate to use their current professional position.

Q: Can we get a sample of ROSC model?

A: Nevada does not recommend one specific model of a Recovery Oriented System of Care. However, many models are available on the Internet. We suggest that you google Recovery Oriented System of Care and include the words problem gambling in the search. One resource that should be high on the results list is the PowerPoint presentation on ROSC that was part of the 28th National Conference on Problem Gambling.

Q: When does "objectively measure data on outputs and performance standards" enter matrix scoring, and/or when will it be looked at, if at all, to help make decisions on how funding is granted?

A: Outputs and performance standards will not be scored. Compliance with performance standards will factor into the funding formula that will be used to determine award amounts for successful applicants. Outputs (i.e., the number of clients to be served) will be based on the award amount.

Q: In the Prevention Application, the executive summary on page 4 states: "Proposals may contain one project, an umbrella project with several related initiatives, or several problem gambling preventions initiatives/projects that are separate or discrete from one another yet managed through a single entity."

1. Can you explain what the difference would be, if any, between "*an umbrella project with several related initiatives*" and "*several problem gambling preventions initiatives/projects that are separate or discrete from one another yet managed through a single entity*".
2. Is it necessary in the Executive Summary to state whether the proposal is an "umbrella project" or "separate projects managed through a single entity"?

A: An umbrella project would be one in which all of the elements are inter-dependent upon each other for success. In other words, the overall goal cannot be met unless all of the individual elements achieve their individual objectives. In contrast, separate projects managed by a single entity would not necessarily have to be inter-related. Each project would be autonomous with objectives that stand alone.

The Executive Summary does not need to specifically make this statement unless the applicant thinks the distinction is vital to understanding the proposal.