

Approved Minutes of the Monday, March 1, 2021 meeting

Director's Office, Grants Management Unit (DO-GMU)
Fund for a Healthy Nevada – **Respite** - Proposal Evaluation

Monday, March 1, 2021, 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Video/Teleconference Information:

Per Governor Sisolak's Emergency Directive 006, there was no physical location required for this video/teleconferenced meeting. Public comments by teleconference were welcomed

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

I. Call to Order

(Welcome, Roll Call, Announcements) Grants Management Unit

The meeting was called to order at 3:02 pm 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:

Lisa Genasci

Tim Doyle

Erika Pond

Julie Lindesmith

Others Present:

Connie Lucido

Julieta Mendoza

Korine Viehweg

Amy Dewitt-Smith

Cyndee Joncas

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 – Respite – Evaluation Summary

(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido presented the average scores and rankings for the nine (9) proposals as a PDF on her shared screen.

Erika Pond asked if the scores came from each of the evaluator tools and asked if she needed to have her notes handy?

Ms. Lucido replied, they did come from the evaluators tool, and notes would be good to have as each proposal is discussed.

Lisa Genasci commented she personally knows the executive director of proposal number eight and asked if it is a conflict of interest for her to have reviewed that proposal?

Ms. Lucido asked if Ms. Genasci felt her scores were affected?

Ms. Genasci said she did not.

Ms. Lucido thanked Ms. Genasci for the information and said she would consult with the Deputy Attorney General’s office. If the situation requires it Ms. Genasci’s score would be removed from the average scores.

IV. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Respite – 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.

Proposal 1:	Family Support Council of Douglas County
Abstract:	<p>Our respite services promote an individual or family centered approach in care planning and delivery. No matter if it is one person or an entire family, we provide direct services to give them the help and support they need. We offer these services free of charge. We provide this support in many ways and collaborate with many agencies in Douglas County, NV. We have a confidential shelter where we provide advocacy, crisis intervention, and promote self-sufficiency. While at the shelter, we teach parenting courses, financial planning, peer counseling, offer therapy and participation in a support group. We offer the same training to individuals not in our confidential shelter. We do thousands of hours yearly in respite for families who have children or who are the guardians for individuals with physical or developmental disabilities. We actively collaborate with the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, Safe Embrace, CAAW, Live Violence Free, and Rural Regional Center. We consistently receive and send referrals to local organizations and agencies such as DCSO, Douglas County Social Services, Douglas Counseling and Supportive Services, Tahoe Youth and Family Services, and FISH. Our target area is Douglas County, which includes the Stateline Nevada casino district at South Lake Tahoe, the townships of Gardnerville, Minden, Genoa, Topaz Lake, Smith Valley and extends all the way to the Southern top of the Carson City area from Clear Creek Road in the Carson Valley, and all of the rural areas such as Topaz Lake.</p> <p>We would like to request a grant in the amount of \$111,285, to be used in the following manner: Personnel expenses for our Executive Director, Program Directors, Program Managers, and Case Managers who oversee and deliver respite services in the amount of \$90,955. Fuel for our Program managers and directors to transport individuals and families receiving respite support in the amount of \$1,044. We request for operating expenses for our offices and shelter supplies, communications, and utilities in the amount of \$2,523. We request for other operating expenses for printing, insurance, workers compensation, NV Dept. of Employment, Training and Rehab and our annual audit in the amount of \$8,520. Indirect costs for administrative work and other areas of indirect expenses such as maintenance, in the amount of \$8,243. This brings the total of our ask to \$111,285.</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>Julie – is located in Douglas County which has few sources for respite Erika – only resource in Douglas County. Tim – agrees.</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>Erika – weak in real examples beyond having a shelter to provide respite services, thought respite was to provide relief for caretakers, no examples of specific respite services examples. Tim – unclear on what is desired to achieve and how to achieve.</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>Julie – concerns about budget, how much currently getting unclear, funds seemed to go to staff (salaries). Lisa – didn't apply or include justifications, also concerned missing justifications for the "other" category, not sure what was being asked for and why it is important. Erika – all of the ask was to bolster staff salaries, there is disconnect on what services are being expanded, specifics were lacking - such as increased availability/hours. Tim – did not explain why funds were required.</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>Lisa – scope mentions increasing staff but increases not reflected in the budget. Tim – did not explain plan of achievement, scope is too general and broad, just says "this is what we are going to do, and here we are doing it", needed more detailed information, step-by-step plan. Julie – currently providing services to 35 and want to increase to 150 individuals, how that will happen unclear Erika – unclear of what respite services are currently provided (reimburse care givers? provide direct care?) and if other activities are funded by these dollars? Was unsure why confidential shelter was referenced as the place respite services would be provided. Julieta answered – some agencies have volunteers who go out and provide respite services to the families, the volunteers are reimbursed for the time spent, some agencies do in-person respite care where younger people are dropped off at a facility to allow caregivers time to activities such as errands or shopping</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Budget justification? Enhanced scope of work – 35 individuals to 150? Confidential shelter as location for respite services?</p>

<p>Proposal 2:</p>	<p>ALS Association Nevada Chapter</p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	<p>Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) was first identified in 1869, and later named in 1939 after Lou Gehrig, a famous baseball player who lost his life to the devastating disease. ALS is a progressive neurodegenerative disease that affects nerve cells in the brain and the spinal cord. When the motor neurons die, the ability of</p>

	<p>the brain to initiate and control muscle movement is lost and voluntary muscle action declines. This progressive degeneration of motor neurons eventually leads to paralysis and death. To help individuals facing ALS, the national ALS Association was established in 1985. The ALS Association Nevada Chapter, an affiliate of the national association, was founded in 2004; it is the only ALS related non-profit organization in Nevada. The mission of the ALS Association Nevada Chapter is to discover treatments and a cure for ALS, and to serve, advocate for, and empower Nevadans affected by ALS to live their lives to the fullest. To that end, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter provides multiple services statewide for those living with ALS, often referred to as pALS, or People with ALS, and their families. The services provided by the ALS Association Nevada Chapter include providing comprehensive care service coordination; providing adaptive and durable medical equipment and aids for daily living; and coordinating respite and other types of pALS/caregiver community support. Overall, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter provides state-wide direct services to approximately 100 pALS and their families on an annual basis.</p> <p>The broad, diverse array of services currently offered by the ALS Association Nevada Chapter already incorporates many of the targeted programs, services, and activities that are supported by the Fund for Healthy Nevada. To that end, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter proposes to support/augment its delivery of Respite Services. If awarded, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter would support the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respite Services: Respite care reduces caregiver burnout and allows caregivers to better serve pALS by supporting the implementation of plans of care for themselves. Respite services may be short or long-term and may be provided in or outside of the home. Respite services may be provided by formal programs and providers or can be offered by pALS informal support networks like family members, friends, or individuals within the community. The ALS Association Nevada Chapter Care Service Coordinators partner with pALS and their families to develop and access respite arrangements that best meet their needs. Respite care may be provided by coordinating and issuing payment directly to providers or reimbursing pALS and caregivers for respite care expenses. While in 2019, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter coordinated 2,884 hours of respite for pALS and their families, like other services offered, respite requests/needs exceed availability. For the purpose of this proposal, the ALS Association Nevada Chapter is requesting an additional \$32,000 to help meet respite request needs that cannot currently be supported. <p>If awarded, this would fund an additional 1,600 of respite services for pALS and their families. The total budget request for this proposal is \$34,560, including the indirect rate (8%).</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>Erika – good explanation of services provided, long track record of other resources received, dedicated to providing respite services, recommend full funding. Tim – clearly explained need, activities, and resources that would be required to fulfill the program, recommended full funding. Lisa – recommended partial funding. Julie – strong application with clear info re: target population, services, and how services will be provided, recommended full funding.</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>Lisa – proposal discussed national organization sustainability, contained little info on local chapter sustainability, contained a lot of emphasis re: executive director and board of directors, contained little info re: who is actually providing services</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</p>	<p>Lisa – requested \$20 per hour for respite care – justification unclear re: what funds cover. Erika – information unclear re: direct charges – does \$20/hour go to the caretakers? Is there a limit/cap? Julietta – there is a set dollar amount per family for vouchers, some families need more help than others. Connie – usually done agency and agency, considered part of their subgrant award, should be in budget narrative. Will include as a question. Julie – scope needed more information.</p>

budget is 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.	<p>Tim – \$20 per hour may be in scope as reimbursement for respite services, but not enough information, scope was consistent with narrative.</p> <p>Lisa – scope of work missing measurable outcomes.</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>\$20 per hour – what services do funds cover? Clarify budget narrative.</p> <p>Scope – measurable outcomes?</p> <p>Is there a cap on the respite services provided, allotment per family?</p>

Proposal 3:	Nevada Rural Counties RSVP Program (RSVP), Respite
Abstract:	<p>Nevada Rural Counties RSVP Program (RSVP) will provide respite care to senior caregivers who provide 24/7 care for disabled and elderly family members suffering from Dementia, Alzheimer's, COPD, and many other debilitating disorders. The Respite Program will be provided in RSVP's 15 rural county service region (Carson City, Churchill, Douglas, Elko, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lyon, Lincoln, Mineral, Nye, Pershing, Storey, White Pine) and Washoe County.</p> <p>Caregiver support through respite care is vital in lowering the stress levels of caregivers, by giving them a break to allow for a healthier quality of life, longer life expectancy, and prevent the institutionalization of their loved ones or even themselves by never having a break from the demands of caregiving. RSVP volunteer caregivers provide 8 to 10 hours of respite care each week to a family. Studies show that 40% of caregivers become ill or die before the person being cared for, thus increasing the likelihood that the loved one will be institutionalized.</p> <p>RSVP will expand and enhance respite services throughout rural Nevada, Carson City and Washoe County with Volunteer Respite Workers to provide caregivers who care for disabled and elderly family members with essential lifesaving breaks. Caregivers will be relieved from the responsibilities of caregiving to improve their health, quality of life, and help them attend to their own needs and not succumb to stress. Care recipients will maintain their independence, receive person-centered care, and avoid premature institutionalization.</p> <p>The Respite Care Program places its emphasis on person-centered practices and uses this approach during client assessments and service plan development. Through appropriate referrals, coordination and collaboration with the family, volunteers, physicians, and other social services agencies - senior citizens (age 60 and above) or adults (age 18-59) with a disability who are being cared for at home, is at the center of their own care with the needs of the caregiver(s) considered.</p> <p>RSVP's holistic approach will provide coordination and collaboration with volunteers, physicians, social service agencies and coalitions that work to address the needs of family caregivers. Project partners include the Sanford Center for Aging, Alzheimer's Association of N. Nevada and California, Nevada Aging and Disability Services Division, Dementia Friendly Nevada Initiative, Nevada Lifespan Respite Care Coalition, and Caregiver Support Initiative. Additionally, RSVP will utilize unique training programs and opportunities to foster respite provider competence and improve caregiver/care recipient well-being. These include Respite Education and Support Tools (REST), Dementia Friends Champion, and the Java Music Program.</p> <p>RSVP respectfully requests \$192,855 under the FHN SFY 2021/2023 funding opportunity for Respite program personnel; travel for program staff to perform site visits, volunteer recruitment, client service plans, outreach, and education; office supplies for 9 field office locations; training materials; and operating expenses including Volunteer Respite Worker incentives. The Project will serve 110</p>

	family caregivers in Year 1 and 120 family caregivers in Year 2 through high quality respite care to alleviate stress among caregivers and care recipients with disabilities which will improve their health, independence, and self-sufficiency.
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Erika – excellent application, recommended partial funding because they asked for more than anyone else, established provider, many collaborators, used volunteers, offers services in rural counties, understands community service, well equipped to provide services.</p> <p>Lisa – clear and well-defined proposal, organization, program, goals, and objectives well defined, recommended partial funding.</p> <p>Tim – great community support, vast volunteer program.</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Tim – proposal covers vast geographic area – concern if will be able to fulfill requirements with such a vast area to cover.</p> <p>Lisa – good that collaboration with Northern Nevada RAVE was discussed but it was unclear whether there were other suppliers of duplicate services, lots of emphasis on oversight, not much emphasis on key personnel doing the work, client success stories missing.</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>Julie – if volunteers are paid are they still volunteers?</p> <p>Lisa – thought the proposal was trying to show value of volunteer hours, no justifications for supplies.</p> <p>Erika – volunteer hours/pay defined on page 24 under 'other', travel expenses are clear.</p> <p>Tim – RSVP pays volunteers.</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>Lisa – good measurable outcomes</p> <p>Tim – scope is split for each year with different comprehensive goals per year, comprehensive in demonstrated numbers, did scope exceed number of pages (per year)?</p> <p>Erika – good tracking and performance measures</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	Was scope of work page limit exceeded?

Proposal 4:	Northern Nevada RAVE
Abstract:	The Northern Nevada R.A.V.E. Family Foundation (RAVE) is requesting \$294,337 to support the continued growth and future development of the RAVE respite care programs for families caring for children with developmental disabilities, a special health care need, and children in foster care. RAVE was established in

	<p>1995 through a grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services with the goal to prevent child abuse and neglect for children with disabilities. RAVE accomplishes this through training youth volunteers to care for these exceptional children in our diverse respite programs: the RAVE Family Center for children 3 months to 6 years of age, the Jr. and Teen RAVE Center and community-based programs for juniors and teens 7 to 22 years old, and the Respite Voucher Program for families unable to utilize center-based respite care.</p> <p>According to the U.S. Center for Disease Control, developmental disabilities affect approximately one out of every seven children. The Washoe County School District reports over 9,000 students with an individualized education plan (IEP), a plan developed for children with special needs. These figures show the need for respite care in Washoe County and Northern Nevada is growing, constant, essential, and larger than our region’s current ability to provide it. This is reflected in the ever-increasing number of children and families RAVE serves annually. From 2013 to 2020, RAVE saw an increase in the number of children served in all three of RAVE’s respite care programs: 464% growth in the RAVE Family Center; 397% growth in the Jr. and Teen RAVE programs. RAVE has served families who travel into Reno/Sparks to utilize our services from counties such as Douglas, Lyon, and Carson City. Families from further counties such as Elko would utilize RAVE if it were feasible.</p> <p>Our programs improve the quality of care parents provide to their children. Positive interactions in a welcoming social setting is also an important factor for youth with disabilities to develop social and independent living skills. As RAVE’s respite sessions are available at no cost, we provide respite to a wide range of families, including underserved and low-income households. For families with limited access to transportation, RAVE operates satellite sites at The Rock Church, Nevada Early Intervention Services, and the Boys & Girls Club.</p> <p>As the only center-based respite care program for children with developmental disabilities in Washoe County, RAVE is seeking support to not only continue to care for currently enrolled families, but to assist RAVE in reaching new families by offering more respite care sessions and by recruiting more Respite Service Providers who administer our sessions. RAVE also plans to continue providing respite vouchers for families to receive qualified respite in their homes who are unable to attend center-based sessions either due to underlying health conditions during the COVID-19 pandemic or who live too far from RAVE’s locations. Finally, RAVE is seeking funds to open satellite sites in Carson City and Elko, two locations where families with children with disabilities are severely underserved.</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>Tim – enthusiastic expansion of their services, well described and documented, appears will be able to implement plan.</p> <p>Lisa – abstract and sustainability plan were clear and well-defined, discussed major accomplishments during pandemic and tied in with success level, focused on capabilities of staff providing services with less emphasis on the oversight of the executive director.</p> <p>Erika – recommended partial funding as amount was 30% of total, strong application, good that serving children with disabilities.</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>Erika – needed more on performance measures other than attendance sheets.</p> <p>Tim – considering the current COVID 19 climate and the vast geographic area will they be able to expand as much as they want, what will they do if they can’t expand?</p> <p>Lisa – did not clarify if using an electronic health records system.</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</p>	<p>Lisa – recommended partial funding, needed more clarity on volunteer incentives – why are they needed</p> <p>Tim – budget well defined but would have liked better justification on operating expenses.</p> <p>Erika – are youth volunteer incentives allowed? (SWAG, light meals, and snacks).</p>

budget is 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.	<p>Julie – discusses what will do with funding if can't spend on activities.</p> <p>Lisa – only scope that provided info re: what will do if can't spend due to pandemic, contingency plan.</p> <p>Tim – contingency plan good but does not explain how it will be executed.</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>How will they expand considering the current COVID 19 climate and the vast geographic area?</p> <p>Using electronic health records tracking system?</p> <p>Need more clarity re: justification and use of volunteer incentives.</p>

Proposal 5:	Amplify Life
Abstract:	<p>Amplify Life is seeking funding from the Fund for a Healthy Nevada (FHN) “to improve access and coordination for respite services and support” through our Respite Program for 50 unduplicated families and caregivers per year of each project period for the children, teens, or adults with an intellectual, developmental, learning, communication, and/or emotional disability that we serve through our year-round programming in northern Nevada (Washoe and surrounding counties). Partners for the proposed project include the Sierra Regional Center, the Community Services Agency, and Sierra Nevada Journeys. Amplify Life has been providing critical respite opportunities for caregivers in partnership with the Sierra Regional Center for more than 20 years. Our respite services provide a much-needed break from the physical and emotional demands of caregiving and allows caregivers and families to take the opportunity to relax, recharge, and reconnect, to take care of other family members, or to attend to everyday activities without interruption while their loved one is participating in our safe and enjoyable programs. Amplify Life’s respite services and supports are provided through the valuable programs for the individuals with disabilities that we serve including our Zoom classes, or in person programs at our Skills and Recreation Center, and our various recreational, life-expanding camp programs. These programs provide after school and weekend skills courses, cooking classes, social and recreational classes, games, art and crafts, and community exploration and afford individuals with disabilities the opportunities to live, learn, and play as a vital part of their community. Programs goals are to decrease the stress and strain of families and caregivers of persons with disabilities through the provision of high-quality respite services and to improve the emotional and social health and wellness for 50 clients with disabilities for an estimated 2,000 hours of respite per project period, through the provision of high-quality respite programs. The disability service array in northern Nevada is minimal and has been historically underdeveloped.</p> <p>In order to improve access and coordination for respite services and supports, it is crucial to have multiple providers offering respite, programs, skills training, and supportive services to meet the unmet needs of this population and their families and offer choice to Nevadans. The total FHN request for each project period is \$54,433 for a total of \$108,866 over two years and will provide for direct services by paying for personnel with less than 10% in indirect costs. Outcomes will be tracked through sign-in sheets, post-program surveys, and customer feedback.</p>
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or ‘pros’ that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Lisa – goals objectives well defined with measurable outcomes, first to define how administrative oversight is applicable to overall program.</p> <p>Tim – very defined number of clients looking to serve, justified everything to that number of clients, project well-conceived and designed, good goals and objectives.</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>Lisa – listed “other surrounding counties”, would have been better to list county names, sustainability plan too generic and not well defined, needed more information re: plans for future, if not funded then where will funds come from? Major accomplishments not well defined as they related to respite and the purpose of the grant. Erika – are they providing camp to kids remotely? Focus not clear in application.</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>Lisa – no supplies or travel requested, unsure if activities were virtual. Erika – appears budget is for two staff members and fringe. Tim – described other staff members who are probably doing direct service, but they were not included in staffing for this budget, needed more explanation for costs involved, how will virtual services be provided?</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>Lisa – goals in scope of work vague, were really definitions of overall achievements, goals were well-defined in the grant but not in the scope of work, scope doesn't match narrative. Erika – agrees, no clarification re: implementation programs</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Expansion on contingency plan during pandemic?</p>

<p>Proposal 6:</p>	<p>Lyon County Human Services</p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	<p>Lyon County is a unique rural county in Northern Nevada that spans over 2,000 square miles with five distinct communities that include Dayton, Silver Springs, Fernley, Yerington, and Smith Valley/Wellington. Lyon County's population is growing quickly with an average of 4% increase each year and with a disproportionately large number of people aged 55 or older for an area of its size. According to the census quick facts, 14.5% of Lyon County residents under the age of 65 have a disability. It is estimated that over 200 million hours of care were provided by informal caregivers in 2014 (The State of the States in Family Caregiver Support, Nevada Profile).</p> <p>The mission of Lyon County Human Services (LCHS) is to enhance the well-being of individuals and families across the lifespan. The department delivers on this mission through four divisions including Administrative Services, Children Services, Adult Services, and Senior Services. The target populations for this funding opportunity are Lyon County residents who provide caregiving services. This includes informal caregivers of any age who care for adults age 60 and older, grandparents/relatives age 55 or older caring for a child, age 18 or younger. This funding would supplement existing funding to expand the Senior Services Division's Caregiver Support Program.</p>

	<p>The Caregiver Support Program utilizes the Powerful Tools for Caregivers (PTC) curriculum. PTC was developed to reach caregivers of adults with chronic conditions. PTC curriculum was later expanded to include classes for in-home caregivers, working caregivers, long-distance caregivers, and grandparent caregivers.</p> <p>"The PTC class curriculum meets the highest-level criteria of evidence-based disease prevention and health promotion programs per the Administration on Aging/Administration for Community Living. The PTC class series received a 2007 National Family Caregiving Award" (https://www.powerfultoolsforcaregivers.org). The Caregiver Classes meet once a week for six weeks and will provide caregivers with tools and strategies to better handle the unique caregiver challenges they face. These classes are led by certified, experienced leaders and range in size from 2-15 caregivers.</p> <p>LCHS has already implemented PTC within Lyon County and has two fully trained and certified staff members, this funding of \$38,865.00 would increase the program by a .5 FTE who would become a certified trainer and allow for more classes and support services to be offered.</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>Erika – strong application, over \$2 million in other funding, established plan for evaluating performance measures, application is one of the better ones received from the rural counties, they are a newer agency trying to get out into the community.</p> <p>Lisa – community organizations and partnerships were well described, capabilities of the team were clear.</p> <p>Tim – as a county agency they have a great idea and are doing the best to help residents in the county.</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>Lisa – would have liked more information re: duplicate services and referrals.</p> <p>Julie – does it count as respite when they are teaching skills to the senior caregivers of youth? Is it an allowable expense?</p> <p>Connie – yes, education to care givers and respite providers is considered an allowable expense.</p> <p>Erika – unclear on the objectives - identifying caregivers, if can't identify caregivers then how do they provide services, unclear if there is a plan for that, the proposal identified they need caregivers but not how to get them, need sustainability plan goals.</p> <p>Lisa – application is missing a sustainability plan, proposal included information re: curriculum which is irrelevant to the question, the organization description lacked major successes, no goals, objectives, or measurable outcomes described in the project implementation.</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>Lisa – unclear how staff will travel, supplies they would have, who will pay for curriculum, any virtual needs.</p> <p>Tim – a "half-time" person was described in the budget narrative, it is presumed the rest of the funding would come from another source.</p>
<p>Changing gears, let's move on to the Scope of Work that was proposed. In</p>	<p>Julie – needed the number of people to be offered services</p> <p>Lisa – agrees, measurable outcomes were lacking</p>

thinking about the activities listed, do you think that it is comprehensive enough to successfully carry out the proposed project? Please discuss.	
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	What are the measurable outcomes?

Proposal 7:	Foundation for Positively Kids
Abstract:	<p>The Foundation for Positively Kids is a non-profit organization well-established as a provider of children’s health care services, with an emphasis on medically fragile and/or special needs children and their families, serving Clark County for over 20 years.</p> <p>The overall purpose of this application is to improve access and coordination for respite services and supports for 45 children with special healthcare needs living in Clark County. Respite care is provided during normal business hours, and nights and weekends/holidays are available upon request. Positively Kids’ respite services promote a family centered approach in care planning and caregiver support. Respite is a period of rest, relief, and rejuvenation, which relieves stress, restores energy, and promotes balance in the life of family members.</p> <p>Objectives include: providing in-home respite services for an annual average of 45 disabled/special needs children; A secondary goal is to reduce isolation and increase opportunities for disabled and special needs children to interact and socialize with other children through participation in our extended medical daycare respite program..</p> <p>Positively Kids provides in-home respite care for disabled children aged birth to 18. We provide temporary, short term, in-home respite care for families and primary caregivers to restore and strengthen their ability to continue caring for a child with medical fragility, special needs, chronic disability, or a child that is at risk of abuse or neglect. Using respite care helps caregivers to maintain their mental stability and physical wellbeing. We also enable special needs children to interact with other children by placing them in our extended care medical daycare program which provides a skilled nurse to accompany medically fragile and/or special needs children to the daycare program.</p> <p>Positively Kids employs only licensed nursing personnel, including bi-cultural/bi-lingual staff. We follow the tenants of a patient centered medical home in caring for children in all of our programs. At Positively Kids data collection for respite services is the responsibility of our Grants Manager, Jolie Courtney. Patient data is recorded in our electronic medical record system from which respite services data will be drawn. Overseeing performance measurement is primarily the task of the Nursing Supervisor. Required grant fiscal and service reporting is done by the Grants Manager.</p> <p>At Positively Kids we maintain a Performance Improvement Committee which meets regularly to review service performance and to recommend any changes needed to improve overall performance and/or patient outcomes. Project data is reviewed and analyzed to determine overall satisfaction with services and to identify any changes in programing that are needed.</p> <p>Grant funds are requested in the amount of \$101,690 for 2021-22 and \$101,690 for 2022-23 and will be used to provide skilled nursing respite services for 45 Clark County medically fragile and/or special needs children and their families per year.</p>
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or	Erika – good application, well established agency, bi-cultural and bi-lingual staff, good handle on service population

‘pros’ that you feel are associated with the project.	
Now, let’s chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Julie – weak on community organizations and partnerships, there may be few partnerships</p> <p>Lisa – agrees, shocked there were no other partnerships listed, successes unclear, data collection vague, not enough information re: key personnel – who is doing the work?</p> <p>Tim – part of the reason could be that they are describing medical as opposing non-medical, their focus is there is no other agency doing things in terms of medical care, glossed over the success stories, the collection of data seemed to be sparse with regarding to services provided</p> <p>Erika – they view themselves as the only agency providing these services for kids (medical services), mentioned they are funded by Clark County Department of Family Services which was confusing</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>Lisa – no justification included for operating expenses, indirect confusing</p> <p>Erika – impression is they receive funding to provide nursing services and they want this grant funds to provide in home care</p> <p>Tim – agrees, good that they are paying for program people not primarily administrative help</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>Erika – the agency might need hand holding in terms of navigating this grant, seems they may have less of an understanding of what needs to be provided to support what they are doing, may need to treat them like a new subrecipient</p> <p>Tim – the scope lacks details, was too generic with standard answers to questions, needed more thought</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	

Proposal 8:	Neighbor Network of Northern Nevada
Abstract:	<p>The Neighbor Network of Northern Nevada (N4) connects people for inclusive, community-based services, volunteer opportunities, and affordable transportation, and is committed to a person-centered approach by planning services with community members (not just for them). In the end of 2019, N4 began implementing a project that aimed to bring a brand-new respite model and supplemental services to family care partners of people with disabilities and older adults in Northern Nevada. This collaborative model allows for choice and self-direction, without limiting a family's access to safe and trained support staff.</p>

	<p>With support from the Fund for a Healthy Nevada, N4's Community Care program will continue to incorporate the five core services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counseling/Support Groups/Caregiver Training: Care consultation (to include telehealth) and expert National Task Group on Intellectual Disabilities and Dementia Practices (NTG) training for at least 76 family care partners of adults over the age of 60. • Respite Care: N4 will provide in-home and community-focused services to people with disabilities over the age of 18 and older adults; particularly those at the highest risk for institutionalization including people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, dementia, and/or related cognitive impairments. Families may choose to have a known friend or family member provide their respite care, or they may choose to have N4 recruit a respite care staff (Community Care Partner) for them. Either way, anyone providing respite care must become an N4 employee and complete an orientation training, background check, and CPR/First Aid certification. 76 will receive up to 20 hours per month of respite services. Requests for additional hours will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. • Supplemental Services: With the use of funding from other sources, N4 will provide transportation vouchers, personal smartphones, and related training for participants to request rides and for use during care consultations and telehealth services. Upon request, N4 will connect project participants with a local community partner for initial mobility screenings, home safety evaluations, and adaptive equipment. At least 80 participants needing assistive devices (such as power wheelchairs, manual wheelchairs, walkers, etc.) will receive this support at no cost. • Access Assistance: Each family will be provided with training and support to learn how to utilize Nevada's No Wrong Door system to locate their local Aging & Disability Resource Center (ADRC), take the Nevada Care Connection online self-assessment to link to other home and community-based services, as well as use the Nevada 2-1-1 online and telephone resource directory. Each information and referral request will be documented by an N4 program coordinator with scheduled follow-up contacts to assess whether the family accessed the service, and why or why not; further assistance will be provided as needed. • Information Services: Throughout the course of this two-year project, N4 will facilitate virtual and in-person group presentations to disseminate information about caregiver support services and respite workforce training information.
--	--

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>Erika – good that it is a newer agency in Northern Nevada, began in 2015, good to add agencies Tim – have good partnerships for being a young agency, appear to be able to work with partners Julie – trying to do innovative things, looking at what people in community want</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>Erika – as a new agency they have limited experience and are asking for four new positions, looking to travel to areas to provide respite services, although goals and objectives are admirable there are concerns with their capacity to implement them with their new status and limited experience, pandemic condition may affect abilities Lisa – abstract missing the defined target area, project partners, and budgetary information which were all required, sustainability plan was too general, would have been good to have the geography defined, difficult to determine if answers were appropriate and clear, timeline for goals and objectives too wordy, would have been better in a table Tim – better if had less words, more succinct words Julie – better if they would have focused on one program or area, the programs and areas were mixed together</p>
<p>Now we are going to move into conversation about the proposed budget. As you think about what was presented, does it seem</p>	<p>Lisa – justifications missing for operating expenses and other Erika – seemed funds were desired for new positions in order to fill capacity, only provided one resume, does agency only have one employee or would other employees be not funded (application only asked for one resume for key personnel)</p>

<p>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>Julie – info needed re: how many current employees do they have? How many are they lacking? Needed explanation on who will use and how laptop will be used. Tim – expansion may have been a little bit fast, no timeline included for hiring, little explanation re: laptop (5 new people and only 1 new laptop), is budget not supposed to be less than 50% or up to 50%? (not a requirement for this NOFO)</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>Lisa - all could have been done in goal one, narrative not well defined, sustainability plan should not be a goal itself and should have been removed, goals 2 and 3 could have been made more concise and added as activities for goal one, would have been good to include more measurable outcomes than just partnerships,</p>
<p>Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?</p>	<p>Justifications for operating and other expenses? How will laptop be used? Who will be using the laptop? Timeline for hiring five new employees?</p>

<p>Proposal 9:</p>	<p>East Valley Family Services, R.O.S.E. (Respite, Opportunity, Support, Education)</p>
<p>Abstract:</p>	<p>R.O.S.E. (Respite, Opportunity, Support, Education) is designed to assist caregivers age 55 and over who have guardianship of children from birth to 18 by providing Respite, Opportunities, Support and Education. The program is a combination of our current Senior Respite and Grand Tech Programs. Senior Respite has been in place for over 9 years and Grand Tech for 1 year. Together they are a complete package.</p> <p>"Respite" funding in the amount of \$600 a year per family, provides funding to support children's activities such as sports, after school clubs, childcare, music lessons, etc., giving caregivers time to replenish themselves. "Opportunity" is provided for caregivers to engage in a virtual platform using a tablet. The tablet is distributed and setup with account information during an initial meeting with a R.O.S.E. Program Specialist. A monthly food spending budget in the amount of \$75.00 per month for 12 months, is awarded to each family. Funding is established through a Post Mate account. Caregivers access their account using a tablet to purchase groceries or dining out with food delivery. "Support" is provided through a monthly virtual support group meeting on the 4th Tuesday of each month. Weekly check-ins are also conducted by the Program Manager. The Family, Senior and Disability Resource Center is also offered to caregivers to assist with application assistance, identification needs, transportation, clothing, hygiene items, household items, school supplies, mental and physical health referrals, legal matters, etc. "Education" is offered to children via virtual story times twice a month. Teen Chat is held once a month with specific topics for teens to discuss. Birthdays and special accomplishments are recognized through certificates of achievement mailed home. Recognizing children in these circumstances are vulnerable just as much as their caregivers makes including them in the R.O.S.E. program and important area of focus.</p> <p>Direct referrals are received from community partners. Caregivers are always welcome to refer themselves. Community partners receive a monthly calendar of events, access to our agency website and contact information for the Program Manager. R.O.S.E. Program presentations are also conducted at partnering agency events, virtual meetings in person and virtual tours. R.O.S.E. Program information can also be found on our agency Facebook page.</p> <p>Data collection for the program consists of an assessment of strengths, sign-in sheets for meetings & children's activities, spending logs for food and/or delivered meals, SAMS input, pre & post program surveys, monthly & quarterly reports, and staff training logs. Electronic and physical files are</p>

	<p>created and stored with password protection. Physical files are stored in locked file cabinets and overseen by the Director of Programs and The R.O.S.E. Program Manager.</p> <p>The R.O.S.E. Program will be implemented under the direction of Jessica Mc Gee, Director of Programs, Ann Taylor, Director of Administration & Finance, Shannon Cole, Family Resource Center Manager, and Travis Brown, Family Support Specialist. Funding for the Senior Respite Program funds will be used to pay for staff salaries, respite activities, Post Mate food budgets, and supplies for a total amount of \$89,877.</p>
Evaluation Review	
In thinking about the overall proposal, please share any positives or 'pros' that you feel are associated with the project.	<p>Erika – established agency, gets referrals from community partners, good details on how performance is measured</p> <p>Tim – enthusiastic</p> <p>Erika – voucher program but separating respite care from a food budget, collaborated with UNLV and Three-Square, unique area of collaboration</p>
Now, let's chat about some of the areas that may not have been as clear, or are maybe a concern.	<p>Lisa – proposal struggled to answer the why, missing sustainability plan, how they are funded was vague, goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes not really there.</p> <p>Tim – not sure if this is a voucher program, talked about giving money directly to clients, have two different dollar figures, unsure what they were planning to do and how they were going to do it.</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>Lisa – budget poorly formatted, hard to decipher application request from answers given, no justification provided for office supplies or food allotment</p> <p>Tim – concern re: \$600, is it a one-time disbursement? How much does that pay for day care? What is the frequency of disbursement? Other proposals seem to have more long-term view.</p> <p>Erika – nature of respite services is to provide a little extra support, it's not a long-term plan</p> <p>Lisa – no justification causes lots of questions.</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>Lisa – no overarching goal listed for goal number one, activities not concise enough, just objectives listed which are not goals</p> <p>Erika – thought goal was specific enough</p> <p>Tim – they don't define how they will provide the vouchers which was major portion of the narrative</p>
Last one! Are there any questions that you would like the GMU to clarify with the applicant?	<p>Frequency of disbursement of \$600?</p> <p>How will vouchers be provided?</p>

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.

V. 2021-2023 Fund for a Healthy Nevada – Respite – Proposal Recommendation Review
(Discussion, Information) Grants Management Unit

Ms. Lucido 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. Information showing the proposed coverage area will be provided. A total of \$640,000 is available for funding and \$1,140,936 in requests was received. The evaluators recommendations and comments will be taken into consideration when preparing the recommendation for the Director. The GMU will reach out to the applicants to clarify the questions identified during this review.

Mr. Doyle asked if the evaluators should have filled in the recommended award amount?

Ms. Lucido replied the conversations about budgets served that purpose.

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.

There were no public comments.

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

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

Ms. Lucido adjourned the meeting at 4:54 p.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.