

FY20 Grants In Aid Cycle Proposed Changes

Office of Grants Management
Department of Community Services
City and County of Honolulu

Agenda

- ▶ Changes to Tier I Scoring
- ▶ Change in Application Requirement
 - Addition of language to prevent grant “Stacking”
- ▶ New format for Applicant Testimony
 - One single day, hours broken up by category and applicants will be asked to come during those times and limit testimony.

Tier I Existing Scoring

- ▶ FY19 used same scoring as Tier II
 - ▶ 99 points max
 - ▶ Same word counts as Tier II
 - ▶ Same Appendix A Budget as Tier II

Tier I Proposed Changes

- ▶ Reduction of total score from 99 to 55
- ▶ Reduction in number of questions in application
- ▶ Reduction of word counts
- ▶ Simplified Appendix A Budget and Deliverable Schedule

Scoring – Tier I

EVALUATION CRITERIA: TIER I (\$5,000 to \$10,000)

The Commission shall use the following Evaluation Criteria (Scorecard) as a basis for selecting and recommending Tier I grants:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
A. Rate the degree to which the community need, stated problem / issue, and target population are effectively validated This section scores the agency's ability to identify such need and significance to the applicable community.	Maximum Points
1. The proposal provides a thorough analysis of the community's priority need / problem and its impact on the community and includes supporting vulnerable target populations and/or low to moderate income areas.	10
Criteria Points	10
B. Rate the quality of the proposed plan This section scores the applicant's effectiveness in articulating a quality, effective and achievable plan which addresses the problem/issue identified.	Maximum Points
1. The proposal shows thorough and thoughtful analysis of why the activity was selected and clearly describes how the activity will effectively address the community's problem / need.	5
2. The proposal describes measurable outcomes that are fully aligned with the purposes and priorities of the GIA Fund. The applicant clearly states performance measures appropriate to the desired outcomes and funding requested.	5
3. The proposal describes a thorough and reasonable action plan appropriate to achieve the stated measureable outcomes. The plan is clear, feasible, and actionable.	10
4. The budget, timeline, and narrative are complete, reasonable, and suitable given the proposed public benefit to be gained. This shall also be reflected in Appendix A, Section III Budget and Section IV Schedule.	10
Criteria Points	30

Scoring – Tier I

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
C. Rate the degree to which applicant demonstrated an ability to perform the proposed grant activity (should be evidence-based) either through past performance, current capacity and/or plan to acquire the capacity to perform This section scores the applicant's successful past performance, or current/planned capacity to perform the grant activity or similar, related activity.	Maximum Points
1. The applicant has demonstrated the capacity to successfully achieve the proposed outcomes. OR The applicant has provided a plan to acquire the capacity to successfully achieve the proposed outcomes, including how the applicant has acquired similar capacity in the past. Responses should include organizational knowledge, staffing, fiscal resources, facilities and other resources, stakeholders and relationships, and other relevant resources.	10
Criteria Points	10
SUBTOTAL Criteria Points	50

Scoring – Tier I

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
E. No City funds or assistance. The highest consideration will be given to applicants that do not receive other funding or any form of assistance from the City and County of Honolulu. While applicants that receive other funding or assistance from the City may apply for Grants in Aid funding, the extent of funding or assistance already received in relation to services provided must be considered prior to awarding Grants in Aid funds. A percentage of the subtotal criteria points will be awarded to grantees based on the criteria below.	%
The applicant has received no funding from the City within the last 3 years.	10%
The applicant has received up to 2 awards from the City within the last 3 years.	7%
The applicant has received between 3-5 awards from the City within the last 3 years.	5%
The applicant has received between 6-9 awards from the City within the last 3 years.	3%
The applicant has received 10 or more awards from the City within the last 3 years.	0%
MAX TOTAL POINTS	55

Grant “Stacking”

- ▶ Occurs when an organization is awarded a grant from a previous fiscal year but does not begin grant activity until the following fiscal year
- ▶ Example, grantee awarded funds in FY18 (most grants start in October 2017) but does not start until July or later of 2018.
- ▶ Some organizations that do this have already been awarded FY19 funds which means their FY19 grant will not begin until 2019 (when most FY20 grants will begin).

Grant “Stacking”

- ▶ This means that the organization will be “holding” on to funds for a year or more.
- ▶ The proposed change will ensure that funds are used in the fiscal year that they are awarded.

Grant “Stacking”

- ▶ The Grant Proposer will be disqualified from receiving FY20 GIA funding if it has an active GIA grant but is not expected to begin the grant activity within the current fiscal year – i.e., if you have a City GIA grant that does not start by June 30, 2019, you may not apply for a FY20 GIA grant. Exceptions may be made for organizations proposing a different grant activity than that which is funded by the previous GIA grant

Applicant Testimony

- ▶ **Single Day Testimony**
 - The day will be divided into four quarters
 - 9:00 am to 10:30 am
 - 11:45 am to 12:30 pm
 - 1 hour lunch
 - 1:30 pm to 3:00 pm
 - 3:15pm to 4:45 pm
 - Grant categories will be assigned a quarter in which organizations may present testimony.
 - Testimony will be no more than two minutes per organization

FY20 Grants In Aid Cycle Proposed Changes

Office of Grants Management
Department of Community Services
City and County of Honolulu

Agenda

- ▶ Changes to Tier I Scoring
- ▶ Change in Application Requirement
 - Addition of language to prevent grant “Stacking”
- ▶ New format for Applicant Testimony
 - One single day, hours broken up by category and applicants will be asked to come during those times and limit testimony.

Tier I Existing Scoring

- ▶ FY19 used same scoring as Tier II
 - ▶ 99 points max
 - ▶ Same word counts as Tier II
 - ▶ Same Appendix A Budget as Tier II

Tier I Proposed Changes

- ▶ Reduction of total score from 99 to 55
- ▶ Reduction in number of questions in application
- ▶ Reduction of word counts
- ▶ Simplified Appendix A Budget and Deliverable Schedule

Scoring – Tier I

EVALUATION CRITERIA: TIER I (\$5,000 to \$10,000)

The Commission shall use the following Evaluation Criteria (Scorecard) as a basis for selecting and recommending Tier I grants:

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
A. Rate the degree to which the community need, stated problem / issue, and target population are effectively validated This section scores the agency's ability to identify such need and significance to the applicable community.	Maximum Points
1. The proposal provides a thorough analysis of the community's priority need / problem and its impact on the community and includes supporting vulnerable target populations and/or low to moderate income areas.	10
Criteria Points	10
B. Rate the quality of the proposed plan This section scores the applicant's effectiveness in articulating a quality, effective and achievable plan which addresses the problem/issue identified.	Maximum Points
1. The proposal shows thorough and thoughtful analysis of why the activity was selected and clearly describes how the activity will effectively address the community's problem / need.	5
2. The proposal describes measurable outcomes that are fully aligned with the purposes and priorities of the GIA Fund. The applicant clearly states performance measures appropriate to the desired outcomes and funding requested.	5
3. The proposal describes a thorough and reasonable action plan appropriate to achieve the stated measureable outcomes. The plan is clear, feasible, and actionable.	10
4. The budget, timeline, and narrative are complete, reasonable, and suitable given the proposed public benefit to be gained. This shall also be reflected in Appendix A, Section III Budget and Section IV Schedule.	10
Criteria Points	30

Scoring – Tier I

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
C. Rate the degree to which applicant demonstrated an ability to perform the proposed grant activity (should be evidence-based) either through past performance, current capacity and/or plan to acquire the capacity to perform This section scores the applicant's successful past performance, or current/planned capacity to perform the grant activity or similar, related activity.	Maximum Points
1. The applicant has demonstrated the capacity to successfully achieve the proposed outcomes. OR The applicant has provided a plan to acquire the capacity to successfully achieve the proposed outcomes, including how the applicant has acquired similar capacity in the past. Responses should include organizational knowledge, staffing, fiscal resources, facilities and other resources, stakeholders and relationships, and other relevant resources.	10
Criteria Points	10
SUBTOTAL Criteria Points	50

Scoring – Tier I

EVALUATION CRITERIA	
E. No City funds or assistance. The highest consideration will be given to applicants that do not receive other funding or any form of assistance from the City and County of Honolulu. While applicants that receive other funding or assistance from the City may apply for Grants in Aid funding, the extent of funding or assistance already received in relation to services provided must be considered prior to awarding Grants in Aid funds. A percentage of the subtotal criteria points will be awarded to grantees based on the criteria below.	%
The applicant has received no funding from the City within the last 3 years.	10%
The applicant has received up to 2 awards from the City within the last 3 years.	7%
The applicant has received between 3-5 awards from the City within the last 3 years.	5%
The applicant has received between 6-9 awards from the City within the last 3 years.	3%
The applicant has received 10 or more awards from the City within the last 3 years.	0%
MAX TOTAL POINTS	55

Grant “Stacking”

- ▶ Occurs when an organization is awarded a grant from a previous fiscal year but does not begin grant activity until the following fiscal year
- ▶ Example, grantee awarded funds in FY18 (most grants start in October 2017) but does not start until July or later of 2018.
- ▶ Some organizations that do this have already been awarded FY19 funds which means their FY19 grant will not begin until 2019 (when most FY20 grants will begin).

Grant “Stacking”

- ▶ This means that the organization will be “holding” on to funds for a year or more.
- ▶ The proposed change will ensure that funds are used in the fiscal year that they are awarded.

Grant “Stacking”

- ▶ The Grant Proposer will be disqualified from receiving FY20 GIA funding if it has an active GIA grant but is not expected to begin the grant activity within the current fiscal year – i.e., if you have a City GIA grant that does not start by June 30, 2019, you may not apply for a FY20 GIA grant. Exceptions may be made for organizations proposing a different grant activity than that which is funded by the previous GIA grant

Applicant Testimony

- ▶ **Single Day Testimony**
 - The day will be divided into four quarters
 - 9:00 am to 10:30 am
 - 11:45 am to 12:30 pm
 - 1 hour lunch
 - 1:30 pm to 3:00 pm
 - 3:15pm to 4:45 pm
 - Grant categories will be assigned a quarter in which organizations may present testimony.
 - Testimony will be no more than two minutes per organization