

Attachment C  
Minutes of March 14, 2013 GMAC Meeting

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

**APPENDIX B – SCORING MATRIX**

**Hunger – One-Stop Shop**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attachment C  
Minutes of March 14, 2013 GMAC Meeting

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

**APPENDIX B – SCORING MATRIX**

**Hunger – Access Points**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attachment C  
Minutes of March 14, 2013 GMAC Meeting

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

**APPENDIX B – SCORING MATRIX**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Examples of Strong and Weak Responses to RFA Questions**

### **Service Delivery**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Collaboration With Partner Agencies**

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

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

Attachment C  
Minutes of March 14, 2013 GMAC Meeting

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

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

### **Sustainability**

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

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

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

Attachment C  
Minutes of March 14, 2013 GMAC Meeting

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Outputs and Outcomes**

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

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

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

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