

Approved Minutes of the Tuesday, March 2, 2021 meeting

Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Director's Office, Grants Management Unit (DO-GMU)

Fund for a Healthy Nevada – **Positive Behavior Support** – Proposal Evaluation

Tuesday, March 2, 2021, 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Video/Teleconference Information:

Per Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006, there will be no physical location required for this video/teleconferenced meeting. Public comments by teleconference are welcome.

Materials: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/>

Agenda items may be taken out of order; items may be combined for consideration by the Workgroup; and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time.

I. Call to Order

(Welcome, Roll Call, Announcements) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 am by Connie Lucido. Ms. Lucido thanked the evaluators for attending the meeting, took roll call and established the attendance of the NOFO evaluators.

Evaluators Present:

Leslie Bittleston

Shayla Holmes

Stacy York

Others Present:

Connie Lucido

Julieta Mendoza

II. Public Comment #1

Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.

There was no public comment.

III. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Positive Behavior Support – Evaluation Summary

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido presented the average scores and rankings for the four (4) proposals as a PDF on her shared screen.

IV. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Positive Behavior Support – Proposal Evaluations and Reviews

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido directed the evaluators attention to the worksheet, explained the process, and invited the evaluators to comment.

Each proposal was reviewed by the evaluators using the questions listed in the worksheet. Comments were entered into the worksheet document included below.

Leslie Bittleston commented that the weakest area in general for all of the proposals is information about the process for identifying the population to be served. “This is the population to be served and this is how the population to be served will be identified”.

Ms. Lucido asked the evaluators if any of them would like to change their scores. Each of the evaluators answered they did not want to change their scores.

Ms. Bittleston thanked the Grants Management Unit for the pre-review work done on the proposals and said this process was a great improvement over the last NOFO round.

Stacy York said it was easy to use the forms to score the proposals.

Proposal 1:	Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), University of Nevada Reno (UNR), Positive Behavior Support-Nevada Family Project (PBS-NV Family)
Abstract:	<p>The Positive Behavior Support-Nevada Family Project (PBS-NV Family) will provide cost effective, empirically validated services that are accessible and responsive to the needs of families and community providers who support individuals with disabilities and challenging behaviors. Currently in Nevada, quality behavior support services are difficult to access due to the high demand for services and the small number of qualified and licensed providers. Additionally, diagnosis and location are barriers to accessing these specific services. This project will increase behavior support access for youth and families to enhance lifestyle and quality of life, while building the capacity of family members/caregivers to promote positive behaviors across environments for youth with disabilities and/or behavioral needs. Through two goals, the PBS-NV Family project will provide an empirically validated, function-based approach to supporting individuals with disabilities and challenging behavior.</p> <p>Goal #1 is to provide in-person Positive Behavior Support training and technical assistance to parents/caregivers/providers that support youth with disabilities and/or challenging behaviors in their homes and communities. This will be accomplished through a series of live workshops available to teams that provide a hierarchy of support based on the needs of the individual. Each workshop will include functional assessments the development of a person-centered behavior support plan. Individual direct observations and consultations with a Licensed Behavior Analyst will follow each workshop to ensure that the supports are adequate and contextualized to the unique cultural needs of the individual. Workshops will be held in English and in Spanish and will be available in urban and rural areas.</p> <p>Goal #2 involves the development and provision of an online learning series on Positive Behavior Support to ensure sustainable capacity development of families, providers, and educators that support youth with disabilities and challenging behaviors. This goal will be accomplished through a series of pre-recorded learning modules, cohorts of trainees, and</p>

	<p>ongoing live technical assistance events. The PBS-NV Family project will partner with existing funding streams from the System of Care (SOC) Project through the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) and general funds through Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) to complete a comprehensive system of behavior supports in Nevada for youth with disabilities and challenging behaviors. The total budget for project is \$320,000 per fiscal year which will provide training and technical assistance to over 440 participants per year and support at least 180 focus individuals per year. Impact of this project will be measured through knowledge gain assessments, behavior change rating scales, quality of life measures, caregiver stress measures, and satisfaction surveys.</p>
Evaluation Review	
<p>In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.</p>	<p>Leslie – agency is in its second year, serves part of rural Nevada, application well written Shayla – serves more than just Clark County, more statewide although not reaching all rural areas, virtual component affords flexibility to reach more Nevadans throughout the state Stacy – bi-lingual aspect good, project touches more people, coped well with not being in person and electronically delivered services</p>
<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p>Shayla – concern that not as much opportunity for in-person touches which target population might benefit more from, concerned with cost per person, ability to market and touch that many people and increase to the proposed numbers throughout the regions, heavy amount of specialists for each virtual setting Leslie – overall cost is pretty high, UNR's indirect cost rate which includes overhead administrative costs, they are also asking for funding for partial project manager and fiscal instead of going to direct services, they are asking for indirect cost rate and funding for personnel – curious as to why</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	<p>Leslie – financial portion easy to follow, doesn't know enough about the program to pull out pieces of the budget, only proposal for this type of services – questioned indirect as well as administrative staff Stacy – indirect cost as well as administrative leads to other questions Shayla – agrees</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out</p>	<p>Leslie – good performance measures, appears comprehensive, virtual vs. personal touch Shayla – comprehensive with rest of application and matched the budget, easy to follow, could see where outcomes would be, could see where things could be reduced through a scope of work perspective</p>

the proposed project? Please discuss.	
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	none

Proposal 2:	Boys Town Nevada, Las Vegas
Abstract:	<p>Boys Town Nevada (BTVN) has a history of providing child and family wraparound services based within targeted schools and communities through classroom training, family stabilization, case management, parenting skills, and school engagement. BTVN is requesting \$136,704.00 from the Fund for a Healthy Nevada to serve 130 students attending schools in the Clark County, Nevada district. Schools are a vital infrastructure in the community and play a critical role in a child’s development. They not only focus on academic outcomes of the students but also the development of the whole child including their social, emotional, and physical well-being. Through the work of School Support Specialists (SSS), BTVN will assist schools in addressing the needs of their students by offering Positive Behavior Supports (PBS). PBS interventions include de-escalation, bridges communication gaps, and linkages to family supports. The SSS serves as a liaison between students, families, teachers, and administrators ensuring that school and family interventions are creating a positive impact. BTVN will provide multi-tiered support services with identified school partners. BTVN has established several strong partnerships with community providers through formal relationships, indicated by a signed Memorandum of Understanding, in addition to informal partnerships. These relationships strengthen and support BTVN’s service delivery, reduces duplication of needed services, and results in positive youth and family outcomes.</p> <p><i>Tier One</i> services are offered to youth and families with a low risk for truancy or poor academic performance to reduce risk factors, encourage positive relationships with school staff, and enhance communication between parents and the school. Services provided in this tier include assistance and information about community resources, absences, or prevention planning to ensure consistent school attendance.</p> <p><i>Tier Two</i> services support skill development for those who are at risk to develop more serious problem behaviors before those behaviors start. Services consist of increased behavioral interventions that focus on the student becoming more accountable for their behaviors while in school. The SSS works with the student, family, and school partner to establish appropriate strategies, focusing on behavioral issues that can impair learning, and practicing alternative prosocial behaviors.</p> <p><i>Tier Three</i> services are offered to students with an increased need. These students will receive additional behavioral interventions and supports to address factors that impact school attendance and well-being. One-on-one interventions are individualized to meet their unique needs and are developed to prevent formal school consequences or truancy that can lead to a court referral, detention, out-of-school suspension, in-school suspension, or office referral. The services proposed in this application focus on the strengths, interests, and needs of each student, empowering students, and their families by giving them a voice in service delivery. These interventions aim to reduce truancy rates and negative behaviors in the classroom while increasing parental engagement and enhancing the student’s school experience and academic performance.</p>
Evaluation Review	

In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Leslie – likes seeing programs centered around truancy, not very many programs that addresses kids who exhibit chronic truant behavior but have not ended up in the juvenile justice system</p> <p>Stacy – includes parent involvement and engagement is a huge part of student success, impressive data demonstrating impact on students</p> <p>Shayla – application easy to follow</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Leslie – program not offered outside big county like Clark County, however, Clark County is biggest and has needs other counties don't have</p> <p>Shayla – was not sure which schools were planned to be targeted, possible duplication from another service</p> <p>Stacy – application states "select schools" in Clark County – why only "select schools"</p>
Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?	<p>Leslie – no red flags</p>
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	<p>Leslie – why "select schools", eligibility of target population not described adequately</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>Provide description of schools being targeted and target population.</p>

Proposal 3:	United Citizens Foundation
Abstract:	<p>United Citizens Foundation (UCF) is a nonprofit organization founded in 2010. UCF is requesting \$149,485.00 to provide direct mental health, behavioral health, and intensive supportive services to at-risk students. United Citizen Foundation services are easily accessible via School-Based Health Clinics (SBHC), UCF Community Based Health clinics and telehealth services.</p>

Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Services (PBIS) will be utilized in partnership with Clark County School District (CCSD), The Harbor Juvenile Assessment Center, Foster Kinship and ICLV Fatherhood FIRE program. These partnerships will provide referrals and targeted wrap around support services for students. UCF works directly with CCSD school counselors to provide mental health services to students that have been identified as Tier 3.

The geographic area of at-risk services for students and their families served is CCSD campuses and rural Nevada through telehealth where direct facility satellite offices are not available. Telehealth has become a vital piece for UCF to deliver services to those in the rural communities throughout Nevada who do not have access to services as well as to provide mental and behavioral health teletherapy due to the COVID-19 pandemic. UCF operates mental and behavioral health services in 6 locations within Clark County. The priority area of focus is delivering intensive and individualized support to improve behavior by providing formal therapeutic treatment plans and assessments. Our focus will be on achieving positive outcomes while providing crisis intervention and behavioral health services targeted towards students that have been identified as Tier 3. Many of these clients may also be disparate students with poor social determinants, low income, transportation barriers or linguistic barriers. UCF also provides home based services, which allows the students the opportunity to feel the maximum level of comfort since they are in their own space when accessing mental health and support services.

The funds will be utilized to offset the therapy cost of students that are uninsured and/or do not meet eligibility of current funding. In addition, the funds will continue to employ a Clinical Director and a Licensed Mental Health Professionals who will provide direct intensive therapeutic service to students that have been identified at the Tier 3 level with PBIS. In addition to the ability for UCF to proactively provide awareness and evidence-based practices to improve behavior and meet the mental health needs of students, UCF will also use funds support a Community Health Worker who will provide intensive supportive services to the client and their family.

UCF licensed therapists have experience and a proven track record of assisting students undergoing mental health emergencies such as suicidal ideation , behavioral issues, domestic violence, sexual assault, abuse, substance use, difficulty adjusting to peer relational issues such as bullying, or alcohol/substance abuse utilizing best practices. The experience of UCF's therapists as well as the flexibility in the locations and means in which UCF can serve clients will be pivotal in providing services to students that have been identified as Tier 3.

Evaluation Review

<p>In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.</p>	<p>Leslie – serves at-risk population, program addresses target population pre-arrest is positive</p>
<p>Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p>Leslie – eligibility process is not clearly defined, are rural areas of Clark County covered?</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed</p>	<p>Stacy – budget is aligned with goals Leslie – agrees</p>

<p>budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is necessary to carry out the project?</p>	
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.</p>	<p>Leslie – eligibility process not clearly defined</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Better define eligibility requirement for target population.</p>

<p>Proposal 4:</p>	<p>Clark County Department of Family Services</p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	<p>Clark County Department of Family Services (CCDFS) is the local child welfare agency in Las Vegas, Nevada. Among the 3,000 children that are in protective custody in Clark County are children with significant mental health issues and developmental disability diagnoses. It is for these children with the most critical issues that we are applying for \$150,000 for Positive Behavioral Support funding from the Fund for a Healthy Nevada.</p> <p>This subgroup of children needs specialized services to help them develop skills of self-care, receptive and expressive language, learning, mobility, self-direction, and capacity for independent living. The specialized services that will be provided through the Fund for a Healthy Nevada will help these children develop skills with the goal to allow them to transition to the least restrictive placement.</p> <p>This project will address the three Tiers of Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Services. Tier 1 will be addressed by children receiving 1:1 and group services multiple times per week with focus on the individual's skills, deficits, and set goals. The children with developmental disabilities will gain skill advancement through Sport-Social individualized service plans. Children will work toward goals such as decreasing their instances of engaging in aggressive behaviors, communicating explicit requests, and appropriate peer interactions. These actions will attend to the requirements of</p>

Tier 2; these at-risk children will be given opportunities to develop lifelong skills of human interaction to help prevent more serious problems from developing in the future. Tier 3 is accomplished by Board-certified Applied Behavior Analysts to make initial assessments and to periodically update goals.

Developmental disabilities impose enormous personal, social, and economic costs because of their early onset and the lifetime of dependence that often ensues. Children with disabilities often have limited educational opportunities, and as they grow older, will have limited employment options, productivity, and quality of life. The cost- effectiveness of rehabilitation must take into account the long-term benefits of reduced dependency, improved productivity, and quality of life.

Sport-Social is a community provider that bases their practice around Applied Behavior Analytic techniques to help children with special needs learn new skills, gain confidence, and build social behaviors. Sport-Social’s mission is devoted to build self- confidence, social skills, and positive behaviors with children of all ages and abilities. They work with children with special needs by teaching them social skills, emotional maturity, and positive behaviors that will enable them to develop communication skills and promote effective communication. Sport-Social is unique in that children learn and practice these skills while developing talents in their one-of-a-kind facility while engaging in athletic activities, the arts, computers, and music. Sport-Social believes that the most effective social and behavioral instruction occurs with proactive instructors trained and experienced in the principles of behaviors. Sport-Social works with children in small, flexible, individualized groups with very high or 1:1 instructor-to-student ratios.

Evaluation Review

<p>In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or ‘pros’ that you feel are associated with the project.</p>	<p>Leslie – difficult to follow as the proposal information is jumbled with other projects by this agency that she oversees (substance abuse program and MET program), proposal has similarities to the MET program, unsure of target population, are two different groups of clients targeted? Using Unity as data base also confusing as that data base is for child welfare, is the target population in the child welfare system? Stacy – one-to-one individualized support services approach good</p>
<p>Now, let’s chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.</p>	<p>Leslie – travel costs confusing, what are they for? justification needed, why need travel in greater Las Vegas? Stacy – is the contract viewable?</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem that these are reasonable and applicable expenditures to carry out the proposed project? Do you feel that the proposed budget is</p>	<p>Leslie – asked for \$10,000 in travel costs, confusing if in Las Vegas, what are travel costs for? Is there a mileage circle limitation? Stacy – also wondered if could see contract (with contractors) to identify where \$10,000 would be spent on?</p>

necessary to carry out the project?	
Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	Leslie – yes, with clarification of eligibility criteria Stacy – clarity would be helpful,
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Clarify difference in target populations (this proposal vs. MET program). More travel cost justification needed. More eligibility criteria needed.

V. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Positive Behavior Support – Proposal Recommendation Review

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido commented the forms were borrowed from the State Grants Office. She shared her screen again showing the average score ratings. The ranking information will be presented to the Grants Management Advisory Committee (GMAC) at the March 18, 2021 meeting and will be posted to the GMAC web page. Coverage by each proposal will be mapped so Statewide coverage can be determined. \$756,189 in requests was received. \$320,000 is available to fund. Fortunately, funds from Title XX may be available to fill in unfunded areas.

VI. Public Comment #2

Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. In consideration of others who may also wish to provide public comment, please avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken.

Dr. Ashley Greenwald, Project Director, Nevada PBIS Technical Assistance Center, funds one of the proposals “Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE), University of Nevada Reno (UNR), Positive Behavior Support-Nevada Family Project (PBS-NV Family). Dr. Greenwald thanked the workgroup for their proposal review and the opportunity to apply. All of the proposals appear to be of high quality and to address high need. Dr. Greenwald drew the workgroup’s attention to the NOFO’s amendment, which made a significant change in the project description and scope of work. Encouraged workgroup to view the National Organization, the Association for Positive Behavioral Support, which facilitates the empirically validated approach. Not sure if the proposals were in alignment with the amended NOFO. Asked the workgroup to ensure the State is funding what is outlined in the NOFO amendment.

VII. Additional Announcements and Adjournment
(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido thanked the evaluators for their time and energy reviewing the four proposals.

Ms. Lucido adjourned the meeting at 11:08 a.m.

This notice was mailed to groups and individuals as requested and posted on the DHHS website at: <http://dhhs.nv.gov/Programs/Grants/GMU/> and on the State of Nevada Public Meeting Notice website at <https://notice.nv.gov/>. Meeting materials will be available to the public online prior to the meeting or contact the Grants Management Unit via phone at 775-684-3470 or by email: gmu@dhhs.nv.gov.