**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Grants Management Advisory Committee**
**Subcommittee on the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect**
**April 24, 2013 Draft Minutes**

**Meeting Locations**
Carson City: Mental Health and Developmental Services, 4126 Technology Way, 2nd Floor Conf Room
Las Vegas: Health Division, 3811 W Charleston Boulevard Suite 112
Winnemucca: Health Division, 475 W Haskell Street

**Subcommittee Members Present**
Pauline Salla
Kevin Schiller
Ina Dorman

**Subcommittee Members Absent**
Al Conklin
David Jensen

**DHHS Staff Present**
Laurie Olson, Chief, Grants Management Unit (GMU)
Rique Robb, Social Services Program Manager, GMU
Gloria Sulhoff, Administrative Assistant, GMU

**Members of the Public Present**
Las Vegas:
Penny Vallone, Cappalappa Family Resource Center
Andrea Michaels and Karen Kyger, HopeLink
Emily Smith, Nevada Outreach Training Organization
Alicia Davisson and Ileana Delfaus, East Valley Family Services
Lindsey Nelson, Jack Maloy and Howard Olshanky, Boys Town
Amanda Habush, Nevada Institute for Children's Research & Policy (NICRP)
Norma Bucelato, The Salvation Army
Sarah Beers, Clark County Department of Family Services Parenting Project
Jennifer Bevacqua, Olive Crest
Mandy Canales and Salome Kapella, Mojave Adult Child Family Services
Jennifer Findlay and Jaime Weller-LaFavor, St. Rose Dominican Hospital
Yaebin Kim, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension
Monique Harris, Southern Nevada Children First

Carson City:
Jacquelyn Kleinedler and Jeremy Slacking, Children's Cabinet
Dianne Sheridan and Jessica Brown, Tahoe Safe Alliance
Lisa Lee and Jennifer Kline, Advocates to End Domestic Violence
Adrienne Monroe, Safe Embrace
Lisa Yesitis, Erika Lera and Betty Weiser, Ron Wood Family Resource Center
Judy Andreson, Family Resource Center (Elko)
Sue Chambers, Churchill County/FRIENDS Family Resource Center
Rebecca LeBeau, Child Assault Prevention of Washoe County
Lynn Houghton and Sarah Sills, CSA
Alanna Fitzgerald, Washoe County School District – Family Resource Center

DRAFT

**I. Call to Order** **Laurie Olson, Chief, DHHS GMU**

Laurie Olson opened the meeting at 8:44 a.m. when a quorum had been obtained. She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to review proposals that were submitted for funding under the program area of Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect. Ms. Olson introduced the GMAC Subcommittee members who were present and stated that two additional members were unable to attend at the last minute; however, they had provided their proposal review scores to the Department. She announced that the first order of business was to elect a subcommittee chairperson, who would lead the meeting.

- Dr. Ina Dorman nominated Pauline Salla to serve as Chair of the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect GMAC Subcommittee. The nomination was seconded by Kevin Schiller, and there being no objections, Ms. Salla was elected unanimously.

Ms. Salla requested introductions from all present in the Carson City and Las Vegas locations. No staff, committee members or members of the public attended in the Winnemucca location.

**II. Public Comment**

None

**III. Overview** **Laurie Olson**

Ms. Olson stated that the status of the funding has not changed since the RFA was issued. She noted that the budget has some Title XX funds earmarked in reserve to the Department through the first few years of sequestration. The budget closed at the Legislature with only minimal questioning regarding the Hunger funds and Health Access.

Regarding the applications and scores, it was not the Department's intent to distribute the score sheet in advance of the meeting, but because there would be no staff or committee members attending the meeting location in Winnemucca, sending the document in advance via email seemed the best solution to providing it to the public there. She commented that the color coding on the score sheet was mostly for her benefit to assist in determining distribution of program funding across the State. The score sheets presented the programs listed in order by score, from highest-scoring to lowest. The far right-hand column contained a formula-driven dollar amount, which Ms. Olson planned to track on her computer as any changes occurred. The $1,136,408 in Title XX money is not assigned to any program area, and can be used to fund any of the funding priorities. All GMAC subcommittees can request funds from Title XX at the full GMAC meeting. There are two other subcommittees (Wellness, which includes Health Access, Hunger – One-Stop Shops and Hunger – Increase Access Pointsm and Disability Services, including Respite Care, Independent Living and Positive Behavior Support). Mr. Schiller asked if the subcommittee should consider developing a formula for distributing the Title XX money between the subcommittees, such as splitting it three ways. Ms. Olson replied that would be something for the subcommittee to discuss.

Ms. Olson reviewed key points of the award recommendation process, which was covered in detail at the March GMAC meeting. Applicants can be brought to the table for questioning, but it was not required. The subcommittee might choose to question only the highest scoring applicants. She cautioned the members to leave time for discussion and decisions, noting that a 15-minute question and answer session with each of the applicants would take more than seven

hours; 10 minutes each would take 4½ hours. Questioning the top 19 scorers with requests totaling about $1.3 million for 10 minutes each would still take more than three hours. If the subcommittee has no questions, there is no need to bring that applicant forward, but you would want to if you need clarification on anything. Ms. Olson reminded the members that the Department has asked them not to request any budget cuts by percentage, but if there was a concern regarding specific budget items, they should ask that those specific items be cut from the budget. Applicants were advised not to inflate their budgets, so look at them critically. Other adjustments might include the Scope of Work, requesting the elimination of certain elements or the inclusion of something that is not in the Scope of Work. As the applicants are questioned, the members have an opportunity to adjust their scores using the score adjustment sheet that was provided to them. The adjustment sheet includes areas for each scoring category. If you have adjustments, make them by category; do not adjust the overall score. Include your anonymous reviewer number, not your name, on the sheet and at a break Ms. Olson will recalculate the score sheet using the adjusted score.

Next on the agenda was conflict of interest disclosure. Ms. Olson asked the subcommittee members to disclose any relationships they might have with any of the applicant organizations, per the GMAC bylaws. If a relationship exists, members can abstain from voting or they can discuss the relationship with fellow subcommittee members to decide.

Ms. Salla stated that she has a professional relationship with Family to Family Connection in Lincoln County through her employment with Juvenile Services, Division of Child and Family Services, but receives no personal benefit.

Mr. Schiller indicated he is a board member and acting chair of Children's Cabinet, which receives several grants through the GMU. However, it is a volunteer position and he receives no direct financial benefit. Ms. Salla and Dr. Dorman both agreed that he should abstain from voting on anything involving Children's Cabinet, so this applicant will be voted on separately from the others.

Dr. Dorman has no conflicts with any of the applicants.

Before turning the meeting over to Ms. Salla, Ms. Olson explained that the subcommittee's recommendations will go to the full GMAC for approval at their May 9 meeting. The GMAC recommendations will then go to DHHS Director Mike Willden, who will have about a week to finalize the results. He usually tries to honor the recommendation of the GMAC, but has made adjustments in the past.

**IV. Review of Proposals** **Pauline Salla**

Ms. Salla recommended adding 30% of the available Title XX funds (about $375,000) to the available Children's Trust Fund (CTF) funds, for a total of $1,099,694 to work with as they reviewed the proposals to make their recommendations. She suggested beginning their review with the highest scoring applicant, down to St. Rose. The subcommittee questioned the applicants as follows.

**Advocates to End Domestic Violence, Positive Parenting Through Family Crisis, represented by Lisa Lee and Jennifer Kline:** no questions

**East Valley Family Services, Bears and Binkies, represented by Alicia Davisson and Ileana Delfaus:**
Q: Under outcomes, you anticipate an 85% rate of ongoing contact. How is that tracked?
A: Program alumni report via written survey at the Bears and Binkies picnic.
Q: Explain the negative balance on the budget summary page.
A: Ileana answered that the request of $28,530 was an error; the total request should be $29,831.

**Family to Family Connection ISD 9, Parent Training: No representative in attendance. Application Disqualified.**

**Children's Cabinet, Project Safe Place, represented by Jeremy Slacking and Jacquelyn Kleinedler:**
Q: Your proposal indicates the youth are from Washoe County. What happens when the youth are from out of your jurisdiction?
A: They're typically in Washoe County at the time. We meet their immediate needs and then contact the area where they were from. A lot are transients from California.
Q: Under outcomes you indicate 80% of families complete the survey. With the high transiency rate, how do you ensure they complete the survey?
A: They are surveyed when exiting the shelter. I don't know if we send surveys out of state.
Q: The budget indicates the Safe Place coordinator makes almost as much as the family therapist. What are the qualifications for the coordinator?
A: Actually, the Safe Place coordinator makes quite a bit less.

**Child Assault Prevention Project of Washoe County, CAP Elementary Abuse Prevention Workshop, represented by Rebecca LeBeau:**
Q: How are kids surveyed 90 days after the program, and are parents surveyed also?
A: A package is sent to each classroom that includes a questionnaire for the kids and a survey and evaluation form for the teachers and adult observers in the classroom. The surveys are conducted in the classroom.
Q: Are you providing services in Washoe County?
A: We provide a workshop and if services are needed, we provide referral.
Q: When will the program begin in Lyon and Carson?
Q: Referral network workshops will be starting in July or the beginning of early August.

**Clark County DFS, Parenting Project, represented by Sarah Beers:**
Q: Do you have a plan to increase the 44% completion rate indicated in your outcomes?
A: Things happen in families over the course of the six- to eight-session program, such as moving away from the school where the classes are offered. My staff makes follow-up calls after the class has ended to register them to make up the classes they've missed.
Q: Are the parent education facilitators contractors?
A: Yes, they are actually part-time Clark County employees.
Q: Is the program happening with Urban Community Trust?
A: Not yet. They want to partner in their location once they're up and running. An MOU *(Memorandum of Understanding)* is in draft form, it takes time to process through the Clark County system.

**Ron Wood Family Resource Center (FRC), Positive Action Program, represented by Lisa Yesitis and Erika Lera:**
Q: Your board of directors list is outdated. Are these people still on your board?
A: Several individuals on the list are no longer on the board.
Q: Your budget summary shows all funding is pending. What happens if you don't receive these pending funds?
A: We will find a way to fund it. We have other funding for the 12- to 18-year-olds and the 1- to 4-year-old components. This grant serves the ages in between those two. (Ms. Olson interjected that funding for the FRC was included in the Department budget and approved.)
Q: You indicated you have a lot of partners but submitted only one MOU. Are there others?
A: We have several MOUS with agency partners and should have been attached to the application. We also have received referrals through informal partnerships.

**Crisis Intervention Services, Tahoe SAFE Alliance Children's Program, represented by Jessica Brown and Dianne Sheridan:**
Q: Do you anticipate your other funding will come through?
A: All are secured now, including the one that was pending.
Q: Under collaboration you listed several partners but have no MOUS.
A: I'm new with the agency and don't know what was attached to the application. We have several formal MOUs and I can send you the documentation.
Q: Outcome 1 provides therapy for only eight children?
A: We are a small, rural community. We serve Incline Village and Crystal Bay. Based on previous experience, eight children is what we are trying to serve.
Q: Then a total of 50?
Y: Yes, that's actually two different outcomes. The eight is for individual therapies. The 50 goes back to our other services including group, case management and education.

**FRIENDS FRC, Parent Training, represented by Sue Chambers:**
Q: Why weren't there more formalized MOUs with your application?
A: Being a small community, we are the everyday referral resource for all agencies in the community. A formal MOU was never requested or required.
Q: Do you have plans to increase the 30% completion rate of parents surveyed?
A: Parents are not mandated to complete the sessions so there is no way to survey them if they don't come back. Those that come through the court system, we absolutely know we can get surveys from.

**Family Resource Center of Northeastern Nevada, Active Parenting, represented by Judy Andreson:**
Q: Your application indicates you collaborate with everyone but have no formal MOUs.
A: None were existing when I started a year ago, but I am working on formalizing those. We have a new one with Communities in Schools since the application was submitted.
Q: As a point of information, you charge small fee. How is that working?
A: This is a new initiative I put in place to work on sustainability of the organization, and it's been well-received. We never deny services to anyone, but they must pay at least $5. We find that people are more invested and engaged.
Q: Your outcomes include providing classes to grandparents. Can you elaborate?

A: In Elko County we're seeing a high percentage of grandparents raising grandchildren. Often children are removed from the custody of parents because of substance abuse. The program helps update their skills and provide new skills.

**Olive Crest Foster Family Agency, Strong Families, represented by Jenniver Bevacqua:**
Q: Under service delivery you address collaborations but in the collaboration section there was no narrative.
A: Because we are the main applicant, I interpreted the question as referring to collaborations for direct services. We pull in our partners for additional support, but not direct services.
Q: In service delivery, you mention the Protective Factors. Where it is described how the program addresses the Six Protective Factors?
A: I tried to summarize within the 250-word limit. (Ms. Bevacque then elaborated on how the program addressed the Six Protective Factors including identifying concrete supports, immediate needs, and in-home parent education regarding child protection.)
Q: What other funds do you leverage to support this program?
A: We are going to be submitting an application for the Title IVB, and we receive federal earmarks. The foundation side of the agency has in the past secured funds from MGM Foundation, The Inglestad Foundation and other private foundations. We also try to leverage with the FRC partners and community volunteers.

**UNLV – Nevada Institute for Children's Research and Policy (NICRP), Choose Your Partner Carefully Campaign, represented by Amanda Habush:**
Q: You have no formal MOUs?
A: We have never needed a formal MOU un ess it is a requirement of the grant. We have been partnering for years with the same partners with no issues, but could obtain MOUs if needed.
Q: Is the program currently being implemented in Churchill County?
A: Not yet. If funded, we want to implement it in different locations because a heavy component is an assessment of the program. So when we get feedback about the training and materials we want to be sure to include different regions in order to address regional differences that may need improvements.
Q: Would you then consider including representation from Churchill County on your board?
A: We are part of the University system and have no control over the Board of Regents.

**University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, Partners in Parenting, represented by Yaebin Kim:**
No questions

**Henderson Allied community Advocates (HACA) aka HopeLink, Family Support Programs, represented by Andrea Michaels:**
Q: How are the family surveys conducted that you mention in your outcomes?
A: We are changing our survey method. They were previously mailed, and we did not get a good response rate. Going forward we will have the case workers help parents complete the survey.
Q: Please clarify the numbers in the leveraging funds section regarding 50 families or 300 unduplicated children?
A: We used an average of two children per family, based on our statistics. Regarding numbers served, we are almost 140 families this year, exceeding our numbers with the down economy.

Q: Regarding your additional funding sources, is that where you are actually providing referral services?
A: We provide referral services, but also support services, rent, back-to-school and other community programs. (Ms. Michaels interjected a note that the organization received approval from the State on a formal name change. They are no longer HACA dba HopeLink but are now officially HopeLink of Southern Nevada.)
Q: The application indicates that training is provided within the first five months of employment. Are they doing case work without training for those first months?
A: Training is completed probably within the first month. All of the employees who work with families receive online training mandated by the FRC policies and procedures, as well as verbal training from case managers, supervisors and other management staff.

**Nevada Outreach Training Organization, Parent Training, represented by Emily Smith:**
Q: You reference "CTF" under service delivery; what is that?
A: Children's Trust Fund.
Q: The strategic plan was last updated in 2009?
A: Our board is currently working on an update. They met on Monday and are close to finalizing it.
Q: Do you have any formal MOUs?
A: We do, but none directly related to this grant. I didn't know if they were relevant to this grant. We have MOUs with the Sheriff's Department, the District Attorney's Office, and the school district for other programs.
A: The budget includes 10% of the executive director salary. Does the executive director spend 10% of time on this program? You have several other programs, correct?
A: That time is spent on oversight. We currently have 13 grants. Some have no oversight and are strictly direct services.

**St. Rose Dominican Health Foundation, Family to Family Connection, represented by Jen Findlay:**
Q: Under service delivery it was difficult to decipher where the Six Protective Factors were.
A: We addressed that under the "describe strategies under the Six Protective Factors" question.
Q: Has there been any change in other funding?
A: Not at this time; that may change in the future.
Q: There was no narrative under collaboration.
A: We did not include anything in the narrative because we thought you were looking for formal MOUs, which we do not have. It is a lengthy, eight-week process at the hospital to obtain an MOU, and we wouldn't be able to do that within the timeframe of the application. We do have informal partnerships with the programs mentioned, with St. Jude's and Living Grace.

The subcommittee reconfirmed that no representative had shown up from Family to Family Connection, and decided to include the next lower scoring applicant in the questioning.

**Washoe County School District FRC Coalition, Parenting Education, represented by Alanna Fitzgerald:**
Q: Are you currently providing these programs? You've included a draft of the MOU.
A: We want to update our MOU but have secured letters of commitment from the three critical partners. We will secure those MOUs as needed moving forward. They have to go through our legal department at the school district.

Q: You indicated that 100% of parents will be surveyed. Is that realistic? And is that your survey, or the Protective Factors survey?
A: Yes, the case workers will provide the Protective Factors survey one-on-one during home visits. We're confident of that rate. We also have a workshop and client satisfaction survey to find out how people felt about the services and the service providers.
Q: Regarding service delivery, please clarify whether you are doing parent training or case management.
A: In this application we are proposing parent training with some case management to support families through FRCs. The services will be provided by the same case worker.
Q: Why do you require two full-time and three part-time positions to train 275?
A: Both programs are labor-intensive. The home visitation program includes six home visits and requires a lot of chasing down the families to set appointments, reschedule cancelled appointments; a lot of lost time there. The other program requires going in small groups working in the schools. It is labor-intensive.
Q: Regarding the other funding you have listed, is your total program budget $721,000?
A: No, the full FRC has a full range of services provided through five offices. What you see here is the parenting component.

## V. Break

The committee took a five-minute recess to submit scoring adjustments and recalculate. Upon reconvening, there were no scoring adjustments.

## VI. Award Recommendations

The application from Family to Family was eliminated because they did not send a representative to the meeting, and attendance was mandatory. The total dollar requests were recomputed along with the amount of Title XX funds that would be required to cover the grant requests.

Ms. Olson suggested that since the subcommittee did ask some budget questions, they might want to consider asking for budget reductions in some areas.

**Recalled Children's Cabinet, represented by Jacquelyn Kleinedler and Jeremy Slacking.**
Q: Please explain the considerable increase in your funding request from last year.
A: In the previous year we provided a three-month program limited to 10 sessions per family. We think they need more, and want to increase to 20 sessions over six months.
Q: To clarify, the increase is for case management, not the crisis intervention piece?
A: Mr. Schiller explained how case management helps prevent the need for further crisis intervention and is a critical piece of the program. Ms. Olson clarified that case management is not required in crisis intervention programs per the RFA.

**Recalled Olive Crest, represented by Jennifer Bevacqua.**
Q: Please explain the increase in your request for this year.
A: In FY11 our request was $200,000+ but we ended up receiving $163,000. We leveraged these funds to maintain our level of staffing but this increase would help us meet the need. This year's request is not as big a jump from what we had originally requested.
Q: How many clients were served last year?
A: Through the third quarter, 75. Our target goal is 80, and we expect to exceed that goal.

**Recalled UNLV NICRP, represented by Amanda Habush.**
Q: Please explain the increase in your request for this year.
A: The current year's funding was only for printing brochures. With this year's funding we will be able to take the program into the community. It also includes a one-hour training component, which was requested by the community partners and those we've been distributing the brochures to.

**Recalled HACA aka HopeLink, represented by Andrea Michaels.**
Q: Please explain the increase in your funding request.
A: This was the first year current management put together the budget piece. Prior years did not include client services or any support staff. In order to provide comprehensive services, we felt support staff, including the executive director and finance director, were needed. The agency provides intensive case management, has no waiting lists, responds immediately, and provides a full array of services, which were not included in the prior year budget.

The subcommittee then discussed various recommendations and funding options depending on the percentage of Title XX funds they might request. Ms. Olson stated that in the current fiscal year, these types of programs are being funded with $1.4 million from Title XX, and cautioned that if the subcommittee decides to cut back on Title XX funds, it would also appear as a decision to cut back on child abuse and prevention programs. She suggested they ask for more and have a backup plan in case they don't get the full amount.

The subcommittee discussed various funding scenarios and backup plans, including flat funding, raising the minimum score of applicants to 90 and above, and percentage decreases proportionate to the scoring levels. They reviewed the amount of Title XX funds required and the geographical distribution of funds for each of the scenarios.

- Mr. Schiller motioned to request approximately 48% of available Title XX funds, approximately $553,734, to fully fund the programs as listed on the score sheet, excluding Children's Cabinet, beginning with Advocates to End Domestic Violence at the top, down to and including Washoe County School District FRC, at the requested amount. The motion was seconded by Dr. Dorman and carried unanimously.

- Dr. Dorman moved to fund Children's Cabinet. Ms. Salla seconded the motion, and there being no discussion, the motion carried unopposed with Mr. Schiller abstaining.

## VII. Public Comment

**Howard Olshanky, Boys Town**. Expressed disappointment in not having an opportunity to speak. He stated that Boys Town is the largest provider of services providing prevention of child abuse and neglect in Southern Nevada, and this lack of funding will have significant impact as they are significant partners of the Department keeping kids out of foster care. He asked that there be some discussion to reconsider funding.

**Norma Bucelato, The Salvation Army.** Noting that the Salvation Army had the smallest request of all, only $10,000, she explained they are the only program providing child abuse and neglect prevention services in Mesquite. While they do not have any MOUs, they provide services through their own agency – the Salvation Army food pantry, SNAP, GovCHA and FRC.

**Karen Kyger, HopeLink.** Thank you for acknowledging we've struggled with reduced funding. It is nice to have the committee acknowledge that we submit for the funding we do need.
**Alanna Fitzgerald, WCSD FRC.** Thank you to committee for your careful consideration and the detail you dug through; it is obvious in the questions you asked.
**Judy Andreson, FRC in Elko.** This may not be the proper forum for this, but the grant process of the FRC is very arduous. In the future, can we spread out the due dates of the grants? I had five to do.

**VIII. Adjournment** **Pauline Salla**

Ms. Salla thanked those present for their attendance. She thanked the subcommittee members for their time and effort, and stated she would see them at the May 9 full GMAC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 11:56 am.

DRAFT