

Montana Children's Trust Fund Grants Meeting

June 3, 2013

Present: Betty Hidalgo (chair), Roberta Kipp, Jamey Peterson, Vicki Turner, Patty Butler, Joanne Eder, Lisa Stroh, Nicole Johnson, Jennifer Garson

Also present for financial report: Sheri Beaucast (?), May Schwartz

Notes taken by Stefanie Flynn

Absent: Mary Gallagher

Betty Hidalgo, Chair, call the meeting to order at 8:18am.

Minutes:

- It was decided to defer the approval of the December minutes until there is more time for corrections to be made.
- It was also decided to postpone the approval of the March minutes. Several corrections were made, but as time was of the essence for this agenda, the board needed to move on. These changes were noted:
 - Mary had proxy, not Roberta.
 - Mary was going to do rewording and restructuring, not Betty.
 - P. 2: Merlin misspelled, CEO at Browning Community Hospital; Stacy Kostell is Administrative Asst to CEO
 - P.3: Annie Whiting Sorrell (spelling, no hyphen), Billings Area Office for Indian Health Services

Discussion of CDC grant:

Jamey was asked to begin the discussion. We have been asked to apply and she feels it is a great opportunity for us for several reasons: to partner with other organizations and entities both inside and outside the state, and also to increase funding. She believes we are in a unique position to get this funding.

Vicky added that Director Opper wants us to apply for this, and a letter of intent has been submitted. It is very competitive, only 5 states will receive funding. It is a 5-year grant, \$180,000 per year for 5 years and she read other details from the application. She met with Diana Frick and Caitlin Jenson to discuss how it might work. CTF would take the lead in this effort. How do we bridge our data together? What are the gaps? Could we look at early childhood (0-6), identifying what are evidence-based practices or non-evidence-based; develop more parent involvement? Do our policies affecting child maltreatment line up? What sort of pilot projects can we do these in communities and can we learn from those we've done? Vicky sees this as a more of a planning grant for the first year, then implementing it through pilot projects and then getting work out in later years of the grant. The structure would be similar to Purple. JoAnne asked about allocating the money and Vicky explained.

Patty said that Early Childhood Services is looking forward to collaborating with CTF and very interested in this grant. Many of the pieces are out there but they are not stitched together, and this grant had the potential to really pull together a lot of new partners. JoAnn thinks it would take us to a different level.

A discussion followed regarding the unexpectedly quick response that arose with this grant. There was much concern expressed by Lisa, Betty, Roberta and JoAnn concerning how the board is informed in

situations like this. Overall they feel there should be much more communication going on between the board, Jamey and Vicky when decisions like these need to be made. This case was unusual because of some very awkward timing. Vicky felt that Director Opper needed to be involved, as this requires a decision by DPHHS to apply and she was able to actually catch him for a quick conversation when there were only a few minutes to get the letter of intent submitted. Both Jamey and Vicky were also overwhelmed with grant work, so the timing was unfortunate. Apologies were made, with an acknowledgment of the need for better communication in the future. It was agreed that this is a very good opportunity and CTF would have been disappointed not to be able to apply.

Sheri asked to share something as an outsider's opinion but with understanding of how the department works: There is a distinction between the CTF office and the CTF BOARD. With this particular grant, it really needed to be the agency taking the lead and not the board. The distinction is a fine line and it is sometimes blurred, but the agency does see those two entities differently.

JoAnn wondered if there should be a separate meeting to discuss this, since the board will need to be intimately involved in this grant. Betty is leaving tomorrow for the national board meeting and knows this will be brought up there, she is very excited about it. Patty is in favor of hiring a grant writer and staff to oversee the grant which would relieve the burden of work for Jamey and the board. Also, if the board would be interested in being involved in piece of it, there are ways for CTF to be on a team to help move the grant forward.

JoAnn made a motion that the Children's Trust Fund will apply for this grant. Patty 2nd. Passed unanimously.

Betty contacted 2 grant writers: Josh Turner and Christine Ellis. Both are same price, Christine has time to do this for us. Josh is unable to do it but very sad about it and suggested we ask Ellen Bush, who does have time. Then Josh could do oversight and they would write it together. JoAnn wondered about asking Melissa, since she's so involved with us already. Patty relayed that Bloom Consulting out of Bozeman is very good. The board decided that they would like to have Ellen and Josh do this. Consensus. The cost will most likely be between \$3,000 - \$5,000.

A time to meet with the grant writers was decided (after confirming space, etc):
Wednesday, June 5th, 10:00 at 111 Sanders.

Betty asked Jamey to invite all board members (call-in), Diana Frick, Caitlin, Sara C, Denise Higgins, Sheri S, Bree Oliver, Jeff Linkenbach?

Financial Report:

May passed around two copies of the budget in two different formats and would like feedback on which one the board would prefer. She then explained the information and answered questions. The 2012 grant have not been awarded yet, so does not appear, but we will be getting it and will most likely be the same amount. We are looking at grant award money and cash that comes from state awards. Sheri talked about the process of deciding which fund monies come from, depending on how the Board decides to spend it. Purple runs from June 1 through July 31. The state fiscal year end is June 30.

May said that although the space listing Miscellaneous items may not be exact, the bottom line is the correct number. JoAnn asked about Divorce filing fee amounts, and Sheri explained that because of the

way that cash comes in and gets coded, it isn't possible to do a perfect breakdown, but yes it is coming in and we can spend it.

- Roberta had a question about where the September meeting money, it's been allocated.
- Lisa asked if we need to spend that \$28,000 right away? No. Vicky explained that it is in our state special revenue fund and we can decide how to spend it.
- May will check on how the \$459 was spent.
- Lisa asked why the grantee's meeting is so expensive and Vicky explained that we pay all expenses for 30-40 people at approximately \$300 per person, which is actually quite low comparatively.
- Roberta asked where the funding for the new grant writer would come from. It was confirmed it will be from that \$28,000, as we can't use our Technical Assistance monies for grant writing.
- Lisa and the board agree that they need to be more active in using that Tech Assist money.
- JoAnn wanted to know what our bottom line is: how much do we have to grant? Jamey explained those numbers.
- Vicky also explained that what this budget shows is what has already been spent, not what there is to spend.

The two budget versions were discussed, with merits for both but May would like the board to choose one. Patty likes that one tells us who the contractors are and would choose the budget status report version. Jamey may be able to the grantee portion of it, as she already works with that information. Sheri/May will get together w/ Patty and Mary to find a better way to present the budget.

Motion: Approve the expenditure for grant writer: Roberta moved to allocate money for the new grant writer, Lisa 2nd, approved.

Motions: Approval of budget. JoAnn makes a motion to approve the financial report, Roberta 2nd, approved.

Evaluation of Grant Proposals:

Jennifer took the lead and did a quick recap of the evaluation plan: how to score, using the matrix, what made it above and beyond for superior, etc., and generally described RFP details. To begin the process, she asked if there were any grants that obviously stood out as being something the board may not be able to fund and everyone agreed that it might be the Evolution application, so it was decided to start with that one and explained the process of scoring each component separately for each grant

EVOLUTION

JoAnn commented that this application seems to have very high costs because they are using private contractors. Although well qualified, the board feels that there are already quite a few good organizations working in Missoula. Also, CTF isn't allowed to deliver service to families who have a case with child welfare already.

1. Table of Contents: Score – 4
2. Letter of Transmittal: Score – 8
3. Abstract or Executive Summary: Score – 10
4. Statement of Need: No collaboration with other organizations in community, statement not clear. Score – 18

5. Goals/Objectives: Not strong preventions; not specific enough; just brochures , going to conference isn't enough; no collaboration: Score – Fail, 10
6. Methods: Score – Good, 35
 - Evidence-based
 - Program activities: good
 - Description of Service Delivery: good details, target completions, well-organized.
7. LOGIC MODEL: minimal, measurements are open-ended, not specific enough for evaluative process, indicators are good, presentation is fair: Score – 6
8. Program Evaluation: Score – Fail, 7
9. Organizational Capability Statement: Score – 12
 - a. Mission/Vision. They addressed these but not well. They described their business, not as their mission/vision/philosophy: failed
 - b. Fair
 - c. Fail (they also have no advisory board which is not required.)
 - d. No chart. Fair, not enough detail.
 - e. Good
10. Staffing/Administration: No job description, no volunteers, no consultant's actual contract, budget questions, no subcontractor, organizational chart would have helped. Score – fail, 7
11. Cooperating Organization: They do describe referrals, but not collaborations, no coordinated system. Not heard from organizations we're working with in Missoula. Fair – 12
12. Letters of Support: Score – Good, 19
13. Budget Line Item Table: Score – 15.
 - a. Personnel: Good, but would have been nice to see where they get those figures.
 - b. Supply/Equipment: fair
 - c. Rent: no in-kind, because they are not nonprofit, no donation for rent – good
 - d. Subcontractors/Consultants: Independent? No contract listed, no information, not clear – fail
 - e. Administrative Fees: Good
 - f. Match/In-kind match: (match is contributing building space – should be in-kind? No matching funds except for brochures, no funds listed for 1st year, they did turn that in-kind into dollars. Don't satisfy that requirement for hard cash match. Failed.
14. Overall Compliance: They are not creating a family resource center, so we can't give them 30,000. At the most, it would be \$15,000. No 5% hard cash match? They didn't identify their target population well enough. Score: Fair - 12

OVERALL SCORE, EVOLUTION: 175

Side note: Also: for next year, eword 5.2.6 AND POSSIBLY REWORK SECTION #14, SINCE THAT AREA IS HUGE.

Side note: Site visit questions, Betty/Lisa – we will need more site visits. Jamey is just looking at numbers/reports, she hasn't done site visits yet. JoAnn asked Jennifer if we can use our past experience with an organization to grade? Yes, we can bring that into it, because most rfp's include that language.

SUNBURST COMMUNITY SERVICE FOUNDATION: (6 Communities)

1. Table of contents: Score – 4
2. Letter of transmittal: Discrepancy between requested amount here and in budget; question for Lincoln county, June 2012? Should be 2013? Score – fair, 7
3. Abstract/executive summary: Like their sensitivity to existing services, outstanding, teen parents, cover huge area with a new program, circle of security great addition. Score – superior, 14
4. Statement of Need: good page numbers/heading, easy to follow, great statistics. Score – superior, 25
5. Goals/Objectives: Score - fair, 18
 - a. Prevention: clear, measurable criteria, identifiable outcomes – superior
 - b. Public awareness: excellent, social media, - superior
 - c. Child abuse prevention month: good examples, strong presence – good
 - d. Developing continuum: MISSING, didn't include this – fail (forgot?)
 - e. Parental involvement: good ownership, grass roots, inclusiveness, community leaders teaching – superior
6. Methods: gave a good definition of model, evidence-based. Based on research, well-founded theory, well-identified.
 - a. Evidence-based – superior
 - b. Program activities – great that they're convening around parent's time, child-care provided, based on participants' needs. - superior
 - c. Description of service, etc: not specific by date, but by weeks, easy to follow – superior
7. Logic Model: young parents and any parents. Need specific inputs/outputs, not seeing inputs. Laid out in narrative, missing a page, key components. Score – good, 9
8. Program evaluation: Score - superior, 15
9. Organizational capability statement: they are not stagnant, have continued to expand as the needs arise: Score - Good, 18
 - a. Superior
 - b. Willing to invest in staff, that makes it superior
 - c. Board: good. Questions about role/qual's?
 - d. Administrative structure: good
10. Staffing and Administration: tracking funding. Score - 18
11. Cooperating organizations: Missing component for Indian communities? Collaborating partners? But had lots of letters. Missing the Process piece. Score - Failed, 6
 - a. Letters of support: Parents, lacking in detail/support
12. Budget: budget and narrative – 5% ok. Came up with match based on administration? Contributed out of budget? Hard cash match only for personnel? Personnel Ok, all rest. Score: 23
13. Overall compliance: Good, 18, missed 2 sections, but quality of the rest was exceptional.

OVERALL SCORE – SUNBURST: 230

NOTE: should we take out qualifications, it's confusing? Role is missing – we are saying that if role is not listed, we will not deduct points on any applicant.

(Note: strike email requirement for all personnel in future?)

FAMILY TREE CENTER, BILLINGS EXCHANGE:

1. Table of contents: 4
2. Letter of transmittal: Good, 9
3. Abstract of Executive Summary: Darkness to Light: To decrease sexual abuse, lots of trainings, but who are we training? Score: fair, 11
4. Statement of need: did a good job on this, well-established, liked that they went to MT women's prison; "no evidence-based program in Yellowstone Co." (Is that true?); about 800 people – score: Good, 21
5. Goals/objectives: question about what they'll do after they've trained the adults. Train the trainer, then use trainers to train the rest. Lots of trying to figure out what they mean, not written clearly, not understanding what they're trying to do. Outcomes. Score: good, 20
 - a. Prevention: low fair
 - b. Public awareness: good
 - c. Child abuse prev. month: good
 - d. Developing continuum: good
 - e. Parental involvement: low good
6. Methods: overall, they're not telling us how they are going to implement their training. That is the problem. Not telling us what the 7 steps. It's all about education. Score – Good, 30
 - a. Evidence-based: wondering where the evidence is? fair
 - b. Program activities: high fair
 - c. Description of service delivery: good
7. Logic model: This actually includes more detail and has goals. Score - Good, 9
8. Program evaluation: attachments. Score – Good, 14
 - a. Measurement – good
9. Organizational Capability Statement: accredited. Score - Good, 18
 - a. Org's mission/vision: good
 - b. Experience: good
 - c. Description: attached. Good
 - d. Org chart: good
10. Staff/administration: not listed by person. Not all have job descriptions. Score - Fair,14
11. Cooperating organizations: Score - Good, 18
 - a. section is good, but no Indian community populations:
12. Letters of support: 2 from parents/4 from orgs: Score - Good, 22
13. Budget: New program, no names? Just position? Rent, typo, should be \$1,200?. No listing of fringe benefits, only 12%. There is an administrator, but why the 4 staff listed? It's all match, but still, an explanation would be helpful. Score- low fair, 15
 - a. Low score for personnel expenses - fail.
 - b. Narrative: 5.2.7 - low fair.
14. Overall compliance: not great, as it was not clearly stated initially what the overall purpose is. Score- fair, 14

Total Score: Family Tree Center: 219

Alliance for Youth: child maltreatment prevention

Overall, a hard format to follow, hard to read. Headed by someone from school district? GF public school system care system.

1. Table of contents: Right side not justified, was hard to read and we can expect a better presentation, but good content. Score - Fair, 3
 2. Letter of transmittal: funding, yes. Overview, yes. Funding, yes. Need, yes. Dates, yes. Addresses, ID, submission. Would have liked to see statistics, and also highly question statement regarding “no other resources.” Best Beginnings/ HMHB, County health dept. There must be more collaboration. Score - good: 8
 3. Abstract/Executive Summary: More formatting issues, all runs together. It has 3 main areas, which is good. The pieces are there. Score- Good, 13
 4. Statement of Need: vague? Score- fair, 15
 - a. Needs/concerns – if there is a needs assessment, there should be more details. Fair
 - b. Elements: low good
 - c. Demographics: good
 - d. High risk: they are missing some current needs assessments that are out there and readily available, such as Better Beginnings. 2002 site is very old. Failed. Non-collaboration is a problem, Better beginnings is already doing Circle of Security.
 - e. Low fair
 - f. Low fair
 - g. Consequences; fair
 - h. Low good
 5. Goals/objectives: Score- fair, 15
 - a. Prevention: fail, not enough information
 - b. Public awareness: fair
 - c. Child abuse prevention: fair
 - d. Service continuum: fair
 - e. Parental involvement: fair
 6. Methods: Score - Good, 36
 - a. Evidence-based: yes, good
 - b. Program activities: high good
 - c. Service delivery/time tables: high good
 7. Logic model: Score - Good, 9
 8. Program evaluation: Some things seem unrealistic. Score - Fair, 11
 9. Organizational capability statement: Score - good, 18
 - a. Mission, vision, evolution, yes: Good.
 - b. General experience: Good
 - c. Lists: yes, superior
 - d. Structure, ID, WC,: good
 10. Staffing and administration: Resumes: good, but no “years service/educ requirements” - fair; Score- fair, 14
- Notes: this org needs to be working w/ ER, Purple crying, HMHB – GRANT FUNDING WOULD BE CONTINGIENT ON COLLABORATING WITH LOCAL PARTNERS.
11. Cooperating Organizations: They list a lot, which is good, but not the local agencies listed above. Score- good, 15
 - a. Letters of support, ok

12. Letter of Support: good letters. Score- good, 23
13. Budget: Score - high good, 23
 - a. Personnel – all good
 - b. Expenses – good
 - c. Rent- good
 - d. Subcontractors – good
 - e. Admin – good
 - f. Match – good
14. Overall compliance: Score – good, 16

Total Score- Alliance for Youth: 219

NOTE: BECAUSE OF GRANT LANGUAGE, IT IS ALLOWABLE FOR THE BOARD TO SIMPLY REVIEW AND RENEW APPLICATIONS PREVIOUSLY FUNDED WHERE THERE IS NO CHANGE IN SCOPE OF PROJECT, AS FOLLOWS:

Community Health partner/ Learning Partners, Livingston: Renewed.

Wraparound services/ holistic approach

L&C Health Dept/ Parenting from the Heart: Renewed.

All is in place and working for this group, networking is key. Fathers are priority. Greg Daly. Well-written grant. Great timeline/spreadsheet and evaluation. Budget is a stretch but it's all we can give them.

Parenting Place Missoula: Renewed.

Made a great case for respite care for children. Some of the things they didn't do last time, they are doing this time. Only potential problem is that they might be coming from welfare system, but those slots will be assigned to their other funders. Doing this for a long time, would like to expand and have an extra day of hospice. Wraparound services. Waiting list for much-needed services. Well-written grant this time, much improved.

Thrive: Renewed.

PAT (parents as teachers) proven as a needed service through a needs assessment, in Bozeman and Belgrade.

Dawson County/Nurturing Tree: Renewed.

Well-established program with lots of outreach, parenting classes, PAT, ACES – so many programs. They do backpack programs for kindergarten prep, too. And mentor-sharing w/ Plentywood. The area is changing fast and they're just trying to keep up. We appreciate them being there, because they are adding stability to the area.

DEAP: Renewed.

A little different, funding them for several years. Only thing in Miles City, summer camp for kids w/ disabilities – a needed support group to allow parents to breathe. Prone to bullying, helping them with that. They do a great job of meeting/exceeding their goals.

District II Alcohol and Drug Program: Renewed.

Really an eye-opener as to what's going on due to oil company presence. Totally community based. They have exceeded their goals. There has been a 62% increase of child-abuse in Richland County last year. Service Lambert, Savage and Sidney. Well-written grant, with a great evaluation tool included.

Forever Families: Renewed.

Adoptive and foster parents in Billings. 1 part-time paid (barely), and the rest volunteer staff. Overall, it's an ok program that we've funded for 2 years but they've been here for 7. Perhaps not enough to ever go around. JoAnn advocates for the parents who are adopting kids that already have a lot of issues. They tried to collaborate with another group which ended up not going well, but they are trying hard to be more sustainable. The kids have been abused but the parents haven't and are trying to help them – the only other option for them is to go back into foster care. She believes it's a crucial program, meeting a unique need. They are meeting their goals, staffing is still a challenge.

***Women's Resource/Community Support Center, looking at both grant applications:**

Asking for \$30K each, a bit surprised they asked for that amount considering our budget. Vicky reported on their reporting, which is good. Lots of bang for buck with current project. Lisa likes that they do some fundraising/requesting donations. Putting that much money into one community isn't realistic. If we renew the Families Program, perhaps they could use some of those monies toward the Adolescent Program, as the scope of their application is already broad enough. They can choose to use it for what they need.

Renew Strengthening Rural Families Program.

Do not consider the other grant due to funding resources.

WORD: Jennifer has a question as to whether the change in scope of this project is acceptable under the existing contract? We need to look at language. It was decided that the contract is too detailed, so we need to score this, and legal dept. not able to make that decision until Wednesday. And now that we're aware of this legal issue, we can work on the language to provide easier renewal and hopefully create a renewal RFP so they won't have to go through this. We didn't know there were options on renewals before this went out.

WORD: Parents as Leaders

A good wraparound system. Work w/ 130 parents, Circle of Security, the Right Question (parents building skills to hold decision-makers accountable). Will partner w/ Parenting Place in Missoula. Since they don't have family resource center anymore, they'll be using the library and Florence schools. Great approach working with homeless families, taking classes to homeless shelters and low-income housing.

1. Table of Contents: Score - 4
2. Letter of Transmittal: everything included. Score- 9
3. Executive summary: some exceptional goals, concise, easy to understand. Score- Good, 14
4. Statement of need: Excellent, well-written. All requirements there. Score- Good, 23
5. Goals/Objectives: Score- 23
 - a. Prevention: good
 - b. Public awareness: good

- c. Child abuse: good
- d. Continuum: superior
- e. Parental involvement: superior.
- 6. Methods: Score- high good: 37
 - a. Evidence-based: superior
 - b. Program activities: high good
 - c. Work plan: high good
- 7. Logic Model: Lots of resources/inputs, outputs/trainings, good measurements/evaluative process. Score- superior, 10
- 8. Program Evaluation: This is more for the entire program, not just for this grant? Score - High good, 14
- 9. Organizational capability statement: Score- Good, 18
 - a. Mission/vision: high good
 - b. Experience/awards: superior
 - c. Provide board list: good
 - d. Structure: good
 - e. ID, WC etc – good
- 10. Staffing/Administration: provided everything. Resumes. Score- good, 18
- 11. Cooperating Organizations: Score – good, 18
 - a. letters of support, good
 - b. referrals, ok
- 12. Letters of support: Score - good, 23
- 13. Budget: Score- high fair, 18
 - a. Personnel, supply, rent: good
 - b. Subcontractors - fail
 - c. Match/budget, good
- 14. Overall compliance: Score: 18

Total Score for WORD: 247

Community Incentive Program –Family Service Center: No need for Review? Seems it's the same programming. Wanted to establish a resource and we won't have funding for that. We will do a clarification letter saying we'll be able to renew current program at the existing level \$15,000, which they would need to agree to. RENEWED.

(NOTE: REWORD section B NEXT TIME AROUND?)

Family Support Network: Triple P Program.

- 1. Table of Contents: formatting issues. Score- 3
- 2. Letter of transmittal: all is there, except Statement of Need is weak, fail. Score- Fair, 7
- 3. Abstract/Executive Summary: good info, spoke about reservations. Score- low good, 13
- 4. Statement of need: all things are here, and good. Score- good, 23
- 5. Goals/Objectives: Score- Fair, 16
 - a. Prevention- good, public awareness – good, child prevention – good, continuum – Homelessness not addressed. Fail.

- Parental involvement – good
6. Methods: Score – high good, 37
 - a. Evidence based – good.
 - b. Program activities – seems more all encompassing than the old program, which may have been their incentive to switch programs. - good
 - c. Service delivery/activities: good
 7. Logic model: lots of information, a little hard to read. Score- 8
 8. Program Evaluation: really hard to read. **Score- Fair, 24 double check, please?**
 9. Organizational capability: Score – Good, 17
 - a. Mission/vision – good
 - b. Experience/accomplishments – fair
 - c. Description – good
 - d. Structure of admin: good, E,f,g yes
 10. Staffing/Admin – needed to update one resume, she’s still in MN?: Score- good, 18
 11. Cooperating Organizations: Score - Fair, 12
 - a. Referrals- fair
 - b. Letters of support - good
 12. Letters of Support. Score - good, 20
 13. Budget: no admin fees, which is good. Prorating cellphones. Included all information, good. Score- good, 22
 14. Overall Compliance: Score - Good, 18 – Included eval tools, marketing brochure, and auditor’s report

Total score – Family Support Network: 226

The Nurturing Center:

Fathers seem to be left out a lot, and this is specific to fatherhood.

1. Table of Contents: non-existent - fail
2. Letter of transmittal: they include all components, yes. Score: Good, 9
3. Abstract Executive Summary: odd that a focus is dads are leaving? Disconnect w/ concept? Score: Fair, 10
4. Statement of Need: Score: good, 23
 - a. Needs: good
 - b. Elements: absent fathers and stresses , good
 - c. Demographics: good
 - d. High risk/needs assessment: good
 - e. Resources: good
 - f. Gaps: good
 - g. Consequences: good
5. Goals/Objectives: Score, high fair, 18
 - a. Prevention: good
 - b. Public awareness: good
 - c. Child Abuse: good
 - d. Continuum, not a good answer, weak answer: fail
 - e. Parental involvement: good
6. Methods: Score, Good, 35

- a. Evidence-based, yes
- b. Program activities, yes
- c. Service delivery, attached work plan, not where indicated. Good.
- 7. Logic Model: good spreadsheet, Score: good, 9
- 8. Program Evaluation: Score, High good, 14
- 9. Organizational Capability, Score: good, 18
 - a. Mission/vision: good
 - b. General experience: superior
 - c. Description: Columns were cut off, Fair
 - d. Structure of Admin, 501, ID, etc – good
- 10. Staffing and Admin: no job descriptions or little, Fair/ resumes – good: Score: low good, 16
- 11. Cooperating Organizations: Good, 18
 - a. Good referrals, networking – superior
 - b. Letters of support: good
- 12. Letters of Support: Score, good, 21
- 13. Budget: Score: Fail, 6
 - a. Personnel: speaker coming in? Not contract? Who/how? (mentioned in logic model) In the past, if we disagreed with an expense, we could choose not to fund that portion? Pending a revised budget for that portion? A lot of money that could be used better? Most of budget is for admin and this. Not much funding left over for their activities. How will you use these funds to support activities?
- 14. Overall compliance – Fair, 12

Total score for Nurturing Center: 209

OVERALL SCORING AND AWARD AMOUNTS:

Comments regarding tied score between Alliance and Family Tree: Cut the Family Tree because of the program focus. Their proposal was fine, but value of program was not satisfactory: No clear understanding of what the trained people were going to do to create sustainable change in reducing child abuse. Budget was too heavy on training/travel. Would like to have seen outcomes involving support groups, regular meetings w/ follow-through, actions and more follow-up.

Sunburst Community Service Fndn: Score 230, \$15,000
 Family Tree Center: Score 219, \$15,000 CUT
 Alliance for Youth: Score 219, \$10,000
 Evolution Services: Score 175, \$30,000 CUT
 Women’s Resource/ Adolescents: \$30,000 CUT
 Nurturing Center: Score 209, \$15,000
 Community Incentive Program: Renew
 Family Support Network: Score 226
 WORD: Score 247
 Dist II Alcohol and Drug Program: Renew
 Dawson County Health Dept: Renew
 Lewis & Clark County Health Dept: Renew
 Community Health: Request 30,000, but Renew at \$25,000
 Parenting Place Missoula: \$15,000

Thrive: \$15,000

DEAP: \$10,000

Forever Families: Renew \$14,980

Women's Resource/ Community Support Center: Rural families: \$15,000

Total: 209,951.19

Patty made the motion to:

- Fund in a renewal process: Parenting Place, Thrive, DEAP, Forever Families, Women's Resource/Rural, Dist II, Dawson County and L&C County.
- Renew the Community Health Partners at \$25,000 and the Community Incentive Program at \$15,000.
- Fund new awardees: WORD, Family Support Network, Sunburst Community Service Foundation at the requested amounts and Alliance for Youth at \$10,000.

JoAnn 2nd. Motion passes unanimously.

Lisa moved that the total amount of contracts to be awarded will be \$209,951.19. Roberta 2nd. Passed unanimously.

Next meetings:

June 19th, Wednesday, 4-6 pm, teleconference.

Betty would like to:

- Discuss CVC, Purple,
- Award letters will be ready
- Review minutes
- Final approval of grant, etc.

August 16th, Friday, 8am-3pm (face-to-face) meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.