

**Grants Management Advisory Committee Meeting (GMAC)**  
DRAFT MINUTES  
March 14, 2013

**Members Present**

Jeff Fontaine	Robert Martinez
Arthur de Joya	Marcia O'Malley
Cindy Roragen	Connie McMullen
Kevin Schiller	Michele Howser, New

**Members Absent**

Dr. David Jensen  
Al Conklin  
Ken Lange - Resigned

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Staff**

Laurie Olson, Chief, Grants Management Unit  
Rique Robb, Social Services Program Specialist (SSPS) III  
Toby Hyman, Social Services Program Specialist (SSPS) III  
Pat Petrie, Social Services Program Specialist (SSPS) III  
Sally Dutton, Social Services Program Specialist (SSPS) III  
Gary Gobelman, Social Services Program Specialist (SSPS) III  
Toni Cordova, Administrative Assistant III  
Gloria Sulhoff, Administrative Assistant II

**I. Welcome, Introductions and Announcements**

Chair Jeff Fontaine opened the meeting. A quorum was established.

Laurie Olson, Chief of the DHHS GMU, reported that Ken Lange had submitted his resignation on Wednesday, March 13, 2013, and a new member in the south, Michele Howser, had been appointed to the committee as a member with knowledge, skill, and experience in the provision of services to children. She is on the faculty of the University of Phoenix and is pursuing her PH.D.

**II. Public Comment**

Las Vegas – None  
Carson City – None

**III. Approval of Minutes – Jeff Fontaine, Chairperson**

- December 13, 2012 – Marcia O'Malley asked that in her comments on Page 7 the word "disabled" preceding the word "youth" be deleted so the sentence will read: "I would strongly recommend that someone from the community who is familiar with the health issues for youth and people with disabilities be appointed to the Wellness Subcommittee." Ms. O'Malley explained that Nevada Revised Statutes require that the person be identified first and then the condition (e.g., with disabilities).

**Motion:** Connie McMullen moved to approve the minutes with that correction.

**Second:** Ms. O'Malley

**Vote:** Unanimously carried

- January 18, 2013 – No changes.

**Motion:** Robert Martinez moved that January minutes be approved.

**Second:** Connie McMullen

**Vote:** Unanimously carried

#### IV. GMAC Orientation to Evaluation Process – GMU Staff

##### Summary of Applications Received

Ms. Olson led the committee through a handout that provided an overview of the proposals received in the FY14-15 Request for Applications (RFA) and pointed out that more than \$13 million in Year One funding was requested while only about \$5.5 million is available. (See Attachment A.) She cautioned that the Legislature was still considering the budget so the amounts available to award are not set in stone. Other points made during this agenda item included the following.

- The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) requested a projection of how the \$2.3 million earmarked for hunger might be spent. The second page of the handout included a table with the requested projections. However, the breakout could change based on the proposals received for hunger projects.
- A table on the first page of the handout illustrated how Social Services Block Grant (SSBG-Title XX) funds are being utilized in FY13. Ms. Olson explained that the purpose for which these funds may be used is versatile. The GMAC will be recommending a distribution plan for FY14-15.
- Ms. Olson said that evaluation of proposals for Respite Care could be handled by either the Subcommittee for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect or the Subcommittee on Disability Services. She recommended that the latter subcommittee take responsibility so that the workload was evenly distributed. Members of the Subcommittee on Disability Services agreed. Ms. McMullen asked whether programs that serve people with early-onset dementia will be eligible to apply for grants if Senate Bill (SB) 86 passes. Ms. Olson said that the bill would not change provisions to the Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN) Disability Services category. These funds have always been available for this purpose. Rather, the bill proposes to broaden the scope of FHN Independent Living grants awarded by the Aging and Disability Services Division.
- Positive Behavior Support (PBS) funds have historically been awarded to three separate university programs. For FY14-15, the three programs have collaborated to submit one proposal. They have requested more than the \$325,000 in FHN funds available for PBS but are hoping to draw some of the Title XX funds. A new applicant for PBS funds is an agency called Step 2.
- Only \$724,679 in Children’s Trust Fund (CTF) and Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) funds are linked to proposals for parent training, child self-protection training and crisis intervention. Historically, however, the GMAC has recommended awarding a significant portion of available Title XX dollars for this purpose. In FY13, these programs are receiving about \$821,000 in Title XX funds.

Committee member Kevin Schiller and Chair Fontaine posed a variety of questions concerning the status of Title XX funding including the impact of federal sequestration, the possible utilization of reserve and the danger of the Legislature sweeping the reserve. Ms. Olson said that so far federal guidance indicates that the hit to Title XX could be anywhere from less than 1% to

about 5%. Currently, Title XX has a reserve of about \$1 million, which would significantly soften the blow over FY14 and FY15. She explained that the reserve accumulated for a variety of reasons, but the biggest single factor is the difference between the spending authority approved by the Legislature and the actual federal award. Historically, the awards have come in a little higher than the budgeted amount. Instead of always going before the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) to draw in the additional funds, DHHS has left the funds in reserve. Any reserve is subject to a sweep by the Legislature if there are deficits elsewhere in the budget. However, DHHS has testified at the Legislature in favor of retaining the reserve due to economic unknowns at both the federal and state levels.

Chair Fontaine asked whether the GMAC might have a role in decisions about how to spend the Title XX reserve. Ms. Olson said the GMAC could make a recommendation to DHHS. If the Director agreed, a work program would need to be submitted to the IFC for consideration. Mr. Schiller related his experiences with work programs and said that the IFC is likely to listen if the proposal is sufficiently detailed. Chair Fontaine suggested that the use of Title XX funds become a standing agenda item in order to keep it on the committee's radar. Ms. Olson reiterated that, until more is known about sequestration and the state budget, it would probably be best to leave the reserve intact.

Chair Fontaine asked whether members of the public wished to make any comments. Paula Berkley, representing the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, asked about a staff person to implement Nevada's Food Security Strategic Plan. Ms. Olson responded that the DHHS GMU currently has a vacant half-time position. DHHS has requested that the Legislature increase it to a full-time position with primary responsibility for food security. Funds to support the position would not be taken from the \$2.3 million earmarked for hunger projects.

### **GMAC Subcommittee Responsibilities**

Ms. Olson reviewed a handout that was drawn from the RFA (see Attachment B). She said that GMU staff was in the process of conducting a technical review of each proposal to determine whether any should be disqualified based on fiscal instability or other serious issues. Staff was also evaluating the proposals in order to provide the GMAC with comments about strengths and weaknesses. Finally, staff will provide notes about any issues related to the performance of existing grantees. When this process is complete, it will be up to the GMAC to actually score the proposals. Packets will be hand-delivered or sent via Federal Express by Friday, April 5, 2013. The deadline to submit scores to the GMU is Monday, April 22, 2013. The next step will be subcommittee meetings.

- Wednesday, April 24<sup>th</sup> – Subcommittee for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect
- Monday, April 29<sup>th</sup> – Subcommittee on Disability Services
- Tuesday, April 30<sup>th</sup> – Subcommittee on Wellness

The full GMAC will consider subcommittee recommendations at their May meeting. Ms. Olson reviewed the following guidelines.

- The GMAC may not bring applicants to the table and ask them to agree to generic budget cuts in order to distribute the available funds among many projects. Instead, the GMAC should fund the best proposals adequately. If cuts are necessary, the GMAC should cite specific budget items or, if a project is scalable, the GMAC may ask the GMU to work with the applicant during the award process to develop a reasonable budget.
- The GMAC may request changes to the proposed scope of work and/or special award conditions to address particular concerns (e.g., potential fiscal instability or program issues).

- If a proposal needs to be funded but full funding is not possible, the GMAC may consider preserving the most effective elements of the proposal and eliminating other elements.

The GMAC's recommendations will go to DHHS Director Mike Willden who typically does his best to honor the GMAC's recommendations but occasionally asks staff to make some adjustments. He will finalize the awards about a week after the GMAC's May meeting. After that, staff will conduct negotiations with the selected grantees and issue awards to be effective July 1, 2013.

GMAC Subcommittee membership was recapped.

- Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect – Dr. Ina Dorman, Al Conklin, Kevin Schiller, Dr. David Jensen and Pauline Salla
- Disability Services – Cindy Roragen, Connie McMullen and Marcia O'Malley
- Wellness – Arthur de Joya, Robert Martinez, Denise Tanata-Ashby and Jeff Fontaine

New GMAC member Michele Howser was appointed by Chair Fontaine to serve on the Disability Services Subcommittee.

Ms. Olson reminded that, at our December meeting, the GMAC discussed inviting ad hoc members to assist with proposal evaluations. She introduced Darlene Dougherty who was under contract with the Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS) to do education and outreach for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Her experience will be valuable in evaluating hunger proposals. At Ms. O'Malley's suggestion, Ms. Olson also said she had contacted Debra Aquino at the Health Division for a volunteer who might assist with evaluations of Health Access proposals.

Chair Fontaine questioned whether half-day subcommittee meetings would be sufficient to dig into the details of line items, budgets and proposals. Ms. Olson asked for feedback on whether to schedule longer meetings or a second meeting for each subcommittee. Ms. McMullen and Mr. Martinez voiced support for the concept of allowing more time. Ms. Howser suggested that the GMAC or the subcommittees set a time limit to discuss each grant, particularly if a potential grantee wanted to disagree with a low score. Ms. Olson clarified that the subcommittees are not required to allow every applicant to testify. Instead, the subcommittees may ask selected applicants to answer questions. She noted that the question/answer period would allow subcommittee members to change scores based on applicant testimony. This part of the process would not be repeated at the full GMAC meeting in May. She concluded by confirming that the GMAC and subcommittees have authority to limit the amount of time spent questioning an applicant.

Chair Fontaine asked whether there is an appeal process for applicants who disagree with their scores (other than making a statement during the public comment period). Ms. Olson said there is not.

Ms. McMullen agreed with Ms. Howser about the idea of time limits to ensure that there is sufficient time at the end of the meetings to make award recommendations. Mr. Martinez asked whether the time crunch at the end of previous meetings was due to room availability. Ms. Olson explained video connections are typically programmed to end at the time designated by the booking even if the room is still available past that point. Mr. Schiller said he was in favor of either an all-day subcommittee meeting or a meeting scheduled over two days. Ms. Olson said her staff would look into these options. She reiterated that the subcommittees are not required to

bring every applicant to the table. Instead, it would be useful to question those with higher scores because they are most likely to be funded in the end. Ms. McMullen noted that the subcommittee chairs could move things along and allow an appropriate amount of time for discussion. Ms. Howser suggested publishing a time limit in advance so applicants are prepared to be concise.

Mr. Fontaine returned to the issue of applicants not satisfied with their scores. Ms. Olson said scoring sheets (with evaluator names deleted) and GMU reviews containing strengths and weaknesses are considered public information and will be released to applicants who request them. She reiterated that there is no appeal after DHHS Director Willden makes final decisions. If the GMAC wanted to add an appeal mechanism prior to that final step, it would be difficult to build into the process at this point. Ms. McMullen said she liked the idea of providing scoring sheets to applicants so they know their strengths and weaknesses.

Chair Fontaine asked Ms. Olson to review the process for adjusting scores during subcommittee meetings. She responded that the GMU prepares a spreadsheet that is formula-driven. Prior to the meetings, initial scores are entered in columns marked with reviewer numbers instead of names. During the meeting, after the question and answer period, subcommittee members are allowed to submit any scoring changes they would like to make. Staff enters the new scores and the spreadsheet recalibrates. Any changes in scores and ranking are read into the record.

#### **Full GMAC Responsibilities**

Ms. Olson restated that there will not be an opportunity at the full GMAC meeting to update scores. Typically, the process involving the full GMAC is easier than the subcommittee process. The full GMAC listens to subcommittee recommendations, asks questions of the subcommittee members or applicants, and moves toward adopt of final recommendations.

#### **Guidance on Evaluating and Scoring Applications**

Ms. Olson reviewed the three scoring matrixes that were published in the RFA. (See Attachment C.) She explained that special scoring tools were needed for Hunger One-Stop Shops and Hunger – Increase Access Points because they each have unique categories such as required collaborative partnerships and planning/development. She also noted that the executive summary in Hunger One-Stop Shop proposals is informational only; it was more important to assign these points to other sections. The scoring matrixes provide clear parameters as to why a response might be scored in a certain range. For example, a high score in service delivery would mean that methods are clear and effectively developed. Ten bonus points are possible for collaborative partnerships described in any proposal other than those submitted under Hunger One-Stop Shops (which are by definition collaborative partnerships).

Ms. Olson introduced GMU staff members who provided some insights about the evaluation process.

Gary Gobelman, Social Services Program Specialist (SSPS) III said that staff will provide strengths and weaknesses in a very straight-forward way, and will make comments on the budget. He recommended that, during the subcommittee meetings, adjustments to scores should be made only to the sections that were specifically addressed during the question and answer period. He said that he had so far reviewed only the Hunger One-Stop Shop proposals but they all have three primary components – staffing, food purchase and operating cost – and they all appear to be scalable. With \$6.9 million in requests and \$2.1 million available, scaling back projects will

probably be necessary in order to meet the goal of funding two to five projects in the north and the south and two or three projects in the rural areas.

Rique Robb, SSPS-III, said that, as a former grantee and the newest GMU staff member, she would suggest that the GMAC truly consider the GMU comments when evaluating proposals. She advised members to review the budget to make sure they match what is in the proposal. If significant changes are needed or an applicant has dismissed a requirement (e.g., the collaborative piece for Hunger One-Stop Shops), scores should reflect that.

Toby Hyman, SSPS-III, reminded members of the Subcommittee for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect to pay attention to whether proposals address requirements for evidence-based programming and use of the Six Protective Factors.

Pat Petrie, SSPS-III, reinforced that the scoring matrix provides strong guidelines for scoring consistency and will serve as a good tool for evaluation.

Sally Dutton, SSPS-III, said that, in her experience, it is important to remember that you can only read and absorb so much at one time without suffering from “reader’s block.” She recommended approaching the task strategically and planning to read only a certain number of grants in one day. That way, evaluators can give their full attention to each proposal.

Ms. Olson reiterated Mr. Petrie’s comment about consistency. It does not matter whether an evaluator tends to be a tough scorer or a liberal scorer as long as all proposals are scored in the same manner. She cautioned that, while some GMAC members may be familiar with one or more applicants, it is important to score proposals on their own merit and not on what one may or may not know about the applicant. Asking questions at subcommittee meetings may help clear up anything that might be missing from an application. If a statement is made in a proposal that particularly stands out, it is acceptable to go back through proposals that the evaluator has already read and reconsider strengths, weaknesses and scores. Ms. Olson supported Ms. Dutton’s idea about breaking the task down into pieces as well as Ms. Hyman’s request to make sure that proposals meet program requirements. She said the evaluation packets will include another copy of the RFA, which has URLs to websites with more detailed information about some of these requirements.

Mr. Martinez noted that he prefers to read proposals first and then review GMU staff comments. This helps him be objective. Ms. Olson said that approach is similar to the subcommittee process in that members evaluate proposals independently first and then come together to discuss them.

Ms. Olson returned the group’s attention to Attachment C to review examples of strong and weak responses to actual questions from applications. The responses, however, were fabricated. She noted that, in the examples, the longer responses tend to be the stronger ones, but that is not always the case. Sometimes a shorter, more concise answer is better than a long, rambling one. Other points made during the review included the following.

- Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) may include more detailed information about collaborative partnerships than an applicant had space to include in the application.
- Strong responses to questions about cost-effectiveness and leveraging of funds demonstrate that a grant awarded through this process would not be the only source of funding or support. A diverse funding base is preferable.
- Strong outcome statements not only count widgets produced but the benefit of the widgets. Anything measured in terms of percentages should include perspective (e.g., the number of clients participating vs. the number reporting positive results).

Mr. Fontaine asked about potential conflicts of interest among GMAC members. Ms. Olson explained that individuals are not allowed to serve on the GMAC if they are employed by organizations that are funded through the GMU. Members who serve on the Board of Directors of an organization that has applied for funding, or have some other close affiliation with an applicant, are required to disclose this information on the record. These members may participate in discussion about proposals but should refrain from sharing inside information that may unduly influence other members. In addition, they are prohibited from voting on funding recommendations that include their affiliate organizations. In the past, this is handled by separating the affiliate organization from any batch recommendations that are made. A separate vote may then be taken on funding for the affiliate organization.

**V. Public Comment**

Las Vegas – None

Carson City – None

**VI. Adjournment**

Chair Fontaine adjourned the meeting.



## Overview FY14-15 FHN, CTF, TXX Proposals

<b>Total of All Requests</b>	<b>\$13,099,772</b>
Fund for a Healthy Nevada - Wellness - Hunger	\$2,100,000
Fund for a Healthy Nevada - Wellness - Health Access	\$300,000
Fund for a Healthy Nevada - Disability - Independent Living	\$325,000
Fund for a Healthy Nevada - Disability - Positive Behavior Support	\$325,000
Fund for a Healthy Nevada - Disability - Respite Care	\$650,000
Children's Trust Fund and federal CBCAP*	\$724,679
Social Services Block Grant (Title XX)**	\$1,136,408
<b>Total Funding Available</b>	<b>\$5,561,087</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>-\$7,538,685</b>

\*CBCAP = Community Based Child Abuse Prevention

\*\*Social Services Block Grant (Title XX) may be applied to any of the program areas funded through this Request for Applications. Historically, these funds have been used to support the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect including respite care for children with disabilities. The FY13 breakout is as follows.

Parent Training, Crisis Intervention, Child Self-Protection Training programs	\$820,731
2-1-1 Support	\$285,155
Hunger Projects	\$95,620
Training for Differential Response Workers	\$20,706
Total Title XX Distribution to Non-State Agencies in FY13	\$1,222,212

All of the proposed allocations listed above are subject to the availability of funds as well as any and all changes made by the 2013 Legislature during the state budgeting process and/or by the United States Congress during the federal budgeting process. If changes occur, amendment(s) to this RFA will be published.



## GMAC Disability Services Subcommittee

Program Area	Organization	FY14 Funding Request
Ind Living/Adaptive Resources	Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation	155,695
Ind Living/Adaptive Resources	Northern Nevada Center For Independent Living	27,864
Ind Living/Adaptive Resources	Rebuilding All Goals Efficiently, Inc (RAGE)	79,791
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	Best Buddies Nevada	50,069
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	Blind Center Of Nevada Inc	32,400
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	Blindconnect Inc	50,165
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	Rebuilding All Goals Efficiently, Inc. (RAGE)	76,958
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	Southern Nevada Center For Independent Living <i>(Student Advocacy Training)</i>	63,763
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	Southern Nevada Center For Independent Living <i>(Ticket to Work)</i>	67,590
Ind Living/Life Skills Training	The Salvation Army Clark County	60,142
Ind Living/Transitional Housing	Accessible Space Inc	140,180
Ind Living/Transitional Housing	St Judes Ranch For Children Boulder City Campus	95,000
Ind Living/Transitional Housing	Step2	47,988
Ind Living/Transportation	Citicare	50,369
Ind Living/Transportation	Nevada Rural Counties RSVP Program Inc	50,369
<b>Total FY14 Funding Requests</b>		<b>1,048,343</b>
<b>Funds Available to Grant from FHN Disability</b>		<b>325,000</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-723,343</b>

## GMAC Disability Services Subcommittee

Program Area	Organization	FY14 Funding Request
Positive Behavior Support	STEP2	4,150
Positive Behavior Support	University of Nevada, Reno	398,654
<b>Total FY14 Funding Requests</b>		<b>402,804</b>
<b>Funds Available to Grant from FHN Disability</b>		<b>325,000</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-77,804</b>

## GMAC Disability Services Subcommittee

Program Area	Organization	FY14 Funding Request
Respite Care - Adults	ALS Of Nevada	66,793
Respite Care - Children	Easter Seals Nevada	244,071
Respite Care - Children	Foundation For Positively Kids	65,000
Respite Care - Children	Head Start Of Northeastern Nevada	103,305
Respite Care - Adults	Nevada Rural Counties RSVP Program Inc	173,033
Respite Care - Children	Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation ( <i>Center-Based</i> )	100,000
Respite Care - Children and Adults	Northern Nevada RAVE Family Foundation ( <i>Voucher</i> )	200,000
Respite Care Children	Olive Crest	135,861
<b>Total FY14 Funding Requests</b>		<b>1,088,063</b>
<b>Funds Available to Grant from FHN Disability</b>		<b>650,000</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-438,063</b>

## GMAC Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect Subcommittee

Program Area	Organization	FY14 Funding Request
Child Self-Protection Training	Child Assault Prevention Project Of Washoe County	81,561
Child Self-Protection Training	Childrens Cabinet Inc A Child And Family Resource	49,006
Child Self-Protection Training	Family And Child Treatment Of Southern Nevada	74,517
Child Self-Protection Training	Henderson Allied Community Advocates	98,974
Child Self-Protection Training	Sierra Association Of Foster Families	24,417
Crisis Intervention	Boys Town Nevada Inc	537,561
Crisis Intervention	Childrens Cabinet Inc A Child And Family Resource	110,321
Crisis Intervention	Crisis Intervention Services	37,578
Crisis Intervention	Olive Crest	266,008
Parent Training	Advocates To End Domestic Violence	27,412
Parent Training	Cappalappa Family Resource Center	41,000
Parent Training	Childrens Cabinet Inc A Child And Family Resource	59,416
Parent Training	Clark County Department of Family Services Parenting Project	89,785
Parent Training	East Valley Family Services	29,831
Parent Training	Family Resource Centers Of Northeastern Nevada	69,145
Parent Training	Family Support Council Of Douglas County	40,054
Parent Training	Family To Family Connection-Isd 9	21,965
Parent Training	FRIENDS Family Resource Center	36,683
Parent Training	Nevada Family Practice Residency Program	92,968
Parent Training	Nevada Outreach Training Organization	54,000
Parent Training	Prevent Child Abuse Nevada at the UNLV Nevada Institute for Children's Research and Policy	32,707
Parent Training	Ron Wood Family Resource Center	88,467
Parent Training	Safe Embrace	25,000
Parent Training	Sierra Association Of Foster Families	25,253
Parent Training	St Rose Dominican Health Foundation	48,708
Parent Training	The Salvation Army Clark County	10,502
Parent Training	The Shade Tree Incorporated	108,926
Parent Training	University of Nevada Cooperative Extension <i>(Little Books)</i>	80,547
Parent Training	University of Nevada Cooperative Extension <i>(Partners in Parenting)</i>	25,533
Parent Training	Washoe County School District	183,600
<b>Total FY14 Funding Requests</b>		<b>2,471,445</b>
<b>Funds Available to Grant from CTF/CBCAP</b>		<b>724,679</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-1,746,766</b>

## GMAC Wellness Subcommittee

Program Area	Organization	FY14 Funding Request
Health Access	Catholic Charities Of Northern Nevada	127,883
Health Access	Children's Cabinet Inc	176,711
Health Access	Community Health Alliance ( <i>formerly HAWC</i> )	99,687
Health Access	Family Resource Centers Of Northeastern Nevada	50,638
Health Access	Healthy Communities Coalition Of Lyon And Storey Counties	65,248
Health Access	Lutheran Social Services Of Nevada	83,074
Health Access	Nevada Health Centers Inc	299,999
Health Access	Partners Allied For Community Excellence	52,845
Health Access	Rebuilding All Goals Efficiently, Inc. (RAGE)	75,994
Health Access	Step2	41,256
Health Access	The Huntridge Teen Clinic Inc	24,174
Health Access	Volunteers in Medicine of Southern Nevada	51,056
<b>Total FY14 Funding Requests</b>		<b>1,148,565</b>
<b>Funds Available to Grant from FHN Wellness</b>		<b>300,000</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-848,565</b>

## GMAC Wellness Subcommittee

Program Area	Organization	FY14 Funding Request
Hunger - Access Points	Accessible Space Inc	41,811
Hunger - Access Points	Community Services Agency	202,500
Hunger - Access Points	Food For Thought Inc	97,411
Hunger - Access Points	Helping Hands Of Vegas Valley Inc	471,323
Hunger - Access Points	Little Peoples Head Start Of Nevada	107,675
Hunger - Access Points	Nevada Community Associates Inc	140,166
Hunger - Access Points	Nevada Partners Inc	598,000
Hunger - Access Points	Senior Center Of Boulder City Inc	120,003
Hunger - Access Points	Womens Development Center Inc	26,195
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Catholic Charities Of Northern Nevada	400,000
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Central Christian Church	375,000
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Church Of The Nazarene	293,198
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Community Services Agency	323,028
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Consumer Credit Counseling Service Of Southern Nevada	333,231
Hunger One-Stop Shop	East Valley Family Services	445,400
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Family Resource Centers Of Northeastern Nevada	433,323
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Lutheran Social Services Of Nevada	272,189
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Nevada Partners Inc	819,515
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Nye Communities Coalition	111,421
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Senior Center Of Boulder City Inc	150,000
Hunger One-Stop Shop	The Food Bank Of Northern Nevada Inc	700,000
Hunger One-Stop Shop	Three Square	479,163
<b>Total FY14 Funding Requests</b>		<b>6,940,552</b>
<b>Funds Available to Grant from FHN Wellness</b>		<b>2,100,000</b>
<b>Difference</b>		<b>-4,840,552</b>

Suggested Distribution of \$2.3M FHN Hunger Funds	Key Elements of Strategic Plan Addressed	Suggested FY14 Funding Amount
Hunger One-Stop Shops	Access, Availability, Collaboration, Education and Outreach, Sustainability	\$1,600,000
Increase Food Access Points	Access, Availability, Education and Outreach, Sustainability	\$500,000
Asset Mapping/Analysis*	Collaboration, Sustainability	\$100,000
Public Awareness/Education	Education and Outreach	\$75,000
Food Policy Council	Collaboration, Sustainability	\$25,000
<b>Totals</b>		<b>\$2,300,000</b>

\*Note that the Asset Mapping/Analysis is a Year One cost. These funds will be allocated to other activities in Year Two depending on need.

**Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) Role in Proposal Evaluation**

Friday, April 5, 2013	Qualified applications and GMU staff comments about strengths and weaknesses are forwarded to GMAC Subcommittee members.
Monday, April 22, 2013	GMAC Subcommittee members submit scores to GMU for compilation.

GMAC Subcommittee members will independently read and score the proposals in accordance with the corresponding scoring matrix in Appendix B. The GMAC Subcommittees are:

- Wellness (*reviewing Hunger and Health Access proposals*);
- Disability Services (*reviewing Respite Care, Positive Behavior Support and Independent Living proposals*), and
- Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (*reviewing Parent Training, Crisis Intervention and Child Self-Protection proposals*).

GMAC Subcommittee members will then convene in video-conferenced public meetings to discuss the proposals and ask questions of applicants. Unless otherwise notified by GMU staff, all applicants are expected to attend the GMAC Subcommittee meeting(s) where their proposal(s) will be considered.

Subcommittee	Date/Time	Location	Video-Conference	Video-Conference
Child Abuse/Neglect	Wednesday, April 24, 2013 1 to 4 pm	Division of Child and Family Services, 1677 Hot Springs Rd., Suite B, Carson City	Health Division, 3811 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 112, Las Vegas	Health Division, 475 W. Haskell St., Winnemucca
Disability Services	Monday, April 29, 2013 8 am to 12 pm	Health Division, 4150 Technology Way, Suite 303, Carson City	Department of Employment, Rehabilitation and Training, 2800 E. St. Louis, Conference Room C, Las Vegas	N/A
Wellness	Tuesday, April 30, 2013 8 am to 12 pm	Health Division, 4150 Technology Way, Suite 303, Carson City	Department of Employment, Rehabilitation and Training, 2800 E. St. Louis, Conference Room C, Las Vegas	N/A

When their deliberations are complete, the GMAC Subcommittees will vote on award recommendations to be presented to the full GMAC. Recommendations may include revisions to a proposal’s Scope of Work and budget. *However, if any award recommendation reduces an applicant’s overall proposed budget, the GMAC Subcommittee will be required to identify specific budget areas to be revised. General and/or across-the-board budget reductions will not be accepted by DHHS.* Results of the GMAC Subcommittee meetings will be communicated to the full GMAC, applicants and stakeholders.

Friday, May 3, 2013	GMU distributes results of Subcommittee meetings to full GMAC, applicants and stakeholders.
Thursday, May 9, 2013	Full GMAC meets to hear reports from Subcommittees, discuss applications, conduct Q/A with applicants, and vote on funding recommendations to DHHS Director.

During the May 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, the full GMAC will hear recommendations from the GMAC Subcommittees, discuss the recommendations and ask any questions they may have of applicants. Applicants whose proposals are recommended for funding by a GMAC Subcommittee are **required** to attend this meeting. Applicants whose proposals are not included in a GMAC Subcommittee’s recommendations may still wish to attend in case the full GMAC decides to consider funding additional projects.

---

### **GMAC Subcommittee Appointments Made at December 2012 Meeting**

- **Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect** – Dr. Ina Dorman, Al Conklin, Kevin Schiller, Dr. David Jensen and Pauline Salla
- **Disability Services** – ~~Ken Lange~~, Cindy Roragen, Connie McMullen and Marcia O’Malley
- **Wellness** – Arthur de Joya, Robert Martinez, Denise Tanata-Ashby and Jeff Fontaine

Ken Lange has resigned from the GMAC. He was filling the seat for “one member with knowledge, skill, and experience in building partnerships between the public sector and the private sector.”

Michele Howser is a new member whose appointment to the GMAC is for “one member with knowledge, skill, and experience in the provision of services to children.”

**Nevada Department of Health and Human Services  
Request for Applications SFY 2014-2015**

**APPENDIX B – SCORING MATRIX**

**Hunger – One-Stop Shop**

The following sections in the required grant narrative will be scored as indicated.

**1. SERVICE DELIVERY (Up to 20 Points)**

- Food and/or supportive service delivery methods are unclear 1 – 7
- Food and supportive service delivery methods are clear but are missing important elements or are not completely developed 8 – 14
- Food and supportive service delivery methods are clear and effectively developed 15 – 20

**2. COLLABORATION – PARTNER AGENCIES (Up to 25 Points)**

- Lead and partner agency roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined 1 – 6
- Lead and partner agency roles and responsibilities are adequately defined 7 – 13
- Lead and partner agency roles and responsibilities are clearly defined 14 – 20
- Lead and partner agency roles and responsibilities provide a strong framework for managing the project and achieving goals 21 – 25

**3. COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND LEVERAGING OF FUNDS (Up to 15 Points)**

- Minimal additional resources included or proposed to be developed, explanation on purchase of cost-effective food is not clear, explanation on percentage of food requested in budget is unclear 1 – 5
- Some additional resources included and/or some future leveraging indicated, adequate explanation on purchase of cost-effective food, adequate explanation of food percentage requested in budget 6 – 10
- Significant additional resources secured and substantial future leveraging indicated, effective explanations on purchase of cost-effective food and of food percentage requested in budget 11 – 15

**4. PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION (Up to 15 Points)**

- Planning activities are unclear or minimally described 1 – 5
- Planning activities are adequately described, timeline and benchmarks are included 6 – 10
- Planning activities are clearly described and provide a clear timeline and benchmarks for success 11 – 15

**5. POPULATION TO BE SERVED (Up to 10 Points)**

- Service area and population are unclear or minimally described 1 – 3
- Service area and population are clear and appropriately described 4 – 7
- Target population is clear and appropriate, plans to target special population are included 8 – 10

**6. OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES (Up to 15 Points)**

- Output/outcomes do not adhere to requirements or are not realistic or reasonable 1 – 5
- Outputs are appropriate in relation to funding request but outcomes reflect minimal impact 6 – 10
- Outputs are appropriate and outcomes reflect substantial, achievable impact 11 – 15

**Nevada Department of Health and Human Services  
Request for Applications SFY 2014-15**

**APPENDIX B – SCORING MATRIX**

**Hunger – Access Points**

The following sections in the required grant narrative will be scored as indicated.

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Up to 15 Points)**

- Proposed service is not explained satisfactorily and relationship to funding priority is weak 1 – 5
- Proposed service is explained satisfactorily but relationship to funding priority needs clarification 6 – 10
- Proposed service is clearly explained and relationship to funding priority is strong 11 – 15

**2. SERVICE DELIVERY (Up to 25 Points)**

- Need is not adequately supported, service delivery methods and strategies are unclear 1 – 6
- Need is adequately supported, service delivery methods are clear, strategies are included 7 – 13
- Need is well supported, service delivery methods are effective, strategies have potential for success, and applicant plans to build community relationships 14 – 20
- Need is well supported, service delivery methods are effective, strategies have potential for success, and applicant has already built strong community relationships 21 – 25

**3. COLLABORATION (Up to 10 Bonus Points)**

- Questions in this section were not answered 0
- Relationships with other agencies are beneficial but need formalization to be a true collaborative 1 – 3
- Responses depict true collaborative partnership with some potential for success 4 – 7
- Responses depict true collaborative partnership with significant potential for success 8 – 10

**4. COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND LEVERAGING OF FUNDS (Up to 15 Points)**

- Minimal additional resources included or proposed to be developed, explanation on purchase of cost-effective food is not clear, explanation on percentage of food requested in budget is unclear 1 – 5
- Some additional resources included and/or some future leveraging indicated, adequate explanation on purchase of cost-effective food, adequate explanation of food percentage requested in budget 6 – 10
- Significant additional resources secured and substantial future leveraging indicated, effective explanations on purchase of cost-effective food and of food percentage requested in budget 11 – 15

**5. PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION (Up to 15 Points)**

- Planning activities are unclear or minimally described, no strategic plan is associated with project 1 – 5
- Planning activities are adequately described, strategic plan exists, timeline and benchmarks are adequately addressed 6 – 10
- Planning activities are clearly described, strategic plan is a working tool, timeline and benchmarks have potential for success 11 – 15

**6. POPULATION TO BE SERVED (Up to 15 Points)**

- “Community” is not well-defined and population to be served is unclear or inappropriate 1 – 5
- “Community” is well-defined but population to be served is not adequately described or inappropriate 6 – 10
- “Community” is well-defined and population to be served is clearly described and appropriate 11 – 15

**7. OUTPUTS/OUTCOMES (Up to 15 Points)**

- Output/outcomes do not adhere to requirements or are not realistic or reasonable 1 – 5
- Outputs are appropriate in relation to funding request but outcomes reflect minimal impact 6 – 10
- Outputs are appropriate and outcomes reflect substantial, achievable impact 11 – 15

**Nevada Department of Health and Human Services  
Request for Applications SFY 2014-15**

**APPENDIX B – SCORING MATRIX**

**Health Access, Independent Living, Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect, Positive Behavior Support, Respite Care**

The following sections in the required grant narrative will be scored as indicated.

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (Up to 15 Points)**

- Proposed service is not explained satisfactorily and relationship to funding priority is weak 1 – 5
- Proposed service is is explained satisfactorily but relationship to funding priority needs clarification 6 – 10
- Proposed service is clearly explained and relationship to funding priority is strong 11 – 15

**2. SERVICE DELIVERY (Up to 25 Points)**

- Services and/or methods of delivery are unclear 1 – 6
- Services and methods are clear but impact on stated problem is not adequately addressed 7 – 13
- Services and methods are clear and impact on stated problem is adequately addressed 14 – 20
- Services and methods are clear, impact on stated problem is effectively addressed, and applicant has strong understanding of their role in the community and with other providers 21 – 25

**3. COLLABORATION (Up to 10 Bonus Points)**

- Questions in this section were not answered 0
- Relationships with other agencies are beneficial but need formalization to be a true collaborative 1 – 3
- Responses depict true collaborative partnership with some potential for success 4 – 7
- Responses depict true collaborative partnership with significant potential for success 8 – 10

**4. COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND LEVERAGING OF FUNDS (Up to 15 Points)**

- Cost of service is relatively high and little or no additional resources are pursued or leveraged 1 – 5
- Cost of service is reasonable and some additional resources are pursued or leveraged 6 – 10
- Cost of service is relatively low and significant additional resources are pursued or leveraged 11 – 15

**5. SUSTAINABILITY (Up to 15 Points)**

- Organization and staff have little or no experience with this service, no strategic plan in place 1 – 5
- Organization and staff have adequate experience with this service, strategic plan exists 6 – 10
- Organization and staff have exceptional experience with this service, strategic plan is a working tool 11 – 15

**6. POPULATION TO BE SERVED (Up to 15 Points)**

- “Community” is not well-defined and population to be served is unclear or inappropriate 1 – 5
- “Community” is well-defined but population to be served is not adequately described or inappropriate 6 – 10
- “Community” is well-defined and population to be served is clearly described and appropriate 11 – 15

**7. OUTPUTS/OUTCOMES (Up to 15 Points)**

- Output/outcomes do not adhere to requirements or are not realistic or reasonable 1 – 5
- Outputs are appropriate in relation to funding request but outcomes reflect minimal impact 6 – 10
- Outputs are appropriate and outcomes reflect substantial, achievable impact 11 – 15

# Examples of Strong and Weak Responses to RFA Questions

## Service Delivery

**For Child Self-Protection Proposals - Describe your method of service delivery and the skill-based curriculum that will be used. Include any citations (preferably an online link) for evidence-based/evidence-informed curriculum.**

**Strong Response:** The child self-protection training program utilizes the evidence-based curriculum *Johnny on the Spot* as recognized by the Children's Welfare Information Portal ([www.childwelfareinformationportal.com](http://www.childwelfareinformationportal.com)). According to national studies posted to the Portal website, this curriculum produces positive outcomes among 85% of children who participate. To maximize program fidelity, agency staff members participate in a one-week course delivered by the *Johnny on the Spot* train-the-trainers. The curriculum utilizes a variety of learning modalities (e.g., visual and auditory) in order to reach children with different learning styles. Modules address the following nationally-recognized child self-protection topics.

- Education about sexual abuse
- Recognizing potential abusers
- Reporting abuse

Recognizing the sensitivity of the subject matter, our organization has worked diligently to obtain the support of parent and faculty organizations associated with the Timbuktu County School District. As a result, we have established a cooperative agreement with the school district that allows us to conduct the training program in classrooms at 10 elementary schools to a target population of children ages 5 through 12. A total of 50 sessions are scheduled over the course of the grant cycle. (See attached Memorandum of Understanding.) Pre- and post-testing will measure the increase in participant knowledge over the course of the eight-week program.

**Weak Response:** Program staff has been trained internally utilizing a variety of educational materials such as printed curriculum, web-based trainings, and local workshops. The staff has created a series of modules designed to address a variety of child self-protection topics such as child abuse and neglect and high-risk situations with strangers as well as known and trusted people. The program is geared for a wide range of child development stages. Children learn to recognize potential abuse and learn skills to protect themselves from abusive situations that they may encounter.

## Collaboration With Partner Agencies

**Identify the lead agency (applicant agency) and partner agencies. Describe the role of each agency.**

**Strong Response:** The Rural Nevada Hunger Project is the lead agency for this collaborative partnership. The Project was established in 1997 and operates a food bank in Jacksonville that supplies 10 food pantries located in Pitkin, Polk, Marion, Spruce and Locust counties. Under the proposed collaborative partnership, the Project will continue this activity but will also serve as the fiscal agent for the grant and facilitate an effort among the aforementioned food pantries to establish common policies and procedures, develop a common database, and seek additional

funding to expand activities to underserved, neighboring counties. The food pantries are identified in the signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) attached to this application. Their primary role in the partnership is to provide immediate assistance to individuals and families with urgent food needs and implement a brief assessment process to identify individuals and families who would like to receive additional help from a partner agency that is fully equipped to link them with supportive services. The agency that has agreed to take on this role within the collaborative partnership is the Friendship Resource Center. Center staff will not only be available in their main office in Jacksonville but a case manager will be out-stationed at the food pantries on a rotating basis. Case managers will (1) conduct a comprehensive assessment to identify benefits and services that will help clients reduce their dependency on the food safety network, (2) assist clients with required forms, and (3) follow-up to ensure completion of the process.

**Weak Response:** The Nevada Rural Hunger Project is the lead agency applying for this grant. Other partners include 10 food pantries in five counties and a resource center. Working together, we will provide immediate food supplies to individuals and families in need, and we will refer clients to appropriate benefits and services if they so desire. Letters of commitment from all partners are attached to this application. We believe this partnership is well-equipped to meet the goals and objectives of a Hunger One-Stop Shop. Collectively, we already serve more than 5,000 households per year and, by working together, we will not only increase this number but also help clients achieve self-sufficiency.

## **Sustainability**

**Is there a strategic plan for this project? If so, respond to the following questions. (1) Was your Board of Directors involved in its development? (2) What timespan does the plan cover? (3) How often is it reviewed and/or revised? (4) How is sustainability addressed in the plan?**

**Strong Response:** The Big Blue Bus Service conducts all of its activities under the auspices of a six-year strategic plan adopted by the Board of Directors in 2008. The vision, mission, goals and objectives were developed following a series of focus group meetings with consumers and providers in our service area within Poplar County. Every January the Board reviews the strategic plan to ensure that the benchmarks established for the preceding year were met and prepare to roll out any new strategies in the current year. Public testimony is invited at this time and any necessary revisions are addressed. The Big Blue Bus Service believes that sustainability is not just about funding. It is about creating and maintaining a strong organization. Section IV of the plan focuses on sustainability in a variety of ways. For example, strategies are included that require the Board to continually seek new sources of funding, recruit and retain a stable volunteer base, support staff training, promote community awareness of our services, and track any statutory or regulatory changes that impact service delivery.

**Weak Response:** The Board of Directors of the Big Blue Bus Service has drafted a strategic plan that will become effective upon its adoption at the Board's April 2013 meeting. The plan will provide direction and guidance for a period of five years. Review and revision will occur

annually. The plan addresses sustainability by requiring the Board to apply for at least two new grants every year.

### **Cost-Effectiveness and Leveraging of Funds**

**State the total funding requested through this proposal. Then list the total dollar amounts of any other funding sources that will contribute to the project. Categorize these funding sources by type (federal, state, local and private) and list the specific sources. Indicate whether any of these funds are dependent upon an award through this RFA. In other words, indicate whether this grant would be used as a match or a way to leverage other funds.**

**Strong Response:** The Community Health Center is requesting \$200,000 over the course of the two-year grant cycle (\$100,000 per year) to serve individuals who do not have a pay source for health care. For FY14, the project has secured \$75,000 from the county where our clinic is located. Additional support will come from one federal grant and one private grant if an award is received through this RFA. The federal grant is not renewable after FY14 but the private grant will be available for up to five years based on performance.

- Johnson County Pilot Grant – \$75,000 – secured
- Federal Supplemental Grant – \$25,000 – pending
- Thomas Janovich Foundation - \$125,000 – pending

**Weak Response:** The Community Health Center is requesting \$200,000 over the course of the two-year grant cycle (\$100,000 per year) to serve individuals who do not have a pay source for health care. No other funds are pending or secured at this time, but we are in the process of researching and writing grant proposals to supplement any award made through this RFA.

### **Outputs and Outcomes**

**Using the output/outcome formula in Appendix A of the RFA, write an output/outcome that measures any other benefit of your service.**

**Strong Response:** The Head Cold Project will reduce the number of days children in the Rosebush School District are absent due to head colds. A partnership with the district gives the Project access to aggregate records that track illnesses associated with absences. A baseline has been established and post-service analysis of updated records will measure success.

“Through the provision of personal health awareness training to 500 students in the Rosebush School District, absences due to head colds will decrease by 20% (from 100 days per semester to 80 days) as evidenced by post-service analysis of aggregate absenteeism records.”

**Weak Response:** We will educate students about how to avoid head colds and, as a result, school absenteeism due to head colds will drop by 50%.