



Governor's Office for Children
State of Maryland Executive Department



To: Local Management Board Chairs and Points of Contact

From: Kim Malat, Deputy Director

Date: January 27, 2017

Re: FY18 Notice of Funding Availability Question and Answer Recap #2

1. From page four: ***"This FY18 Notice of Funding Availability is for a 12-month award for the period of July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. Future funding will be based upon the outcomes and performance demonstrated by the jurisdiction and funding availability."*** Does this mean that future funding awards could be based on performance and outcomes and would require less of a narrative or NOFA submission like this year and last?

While the specifics of the FY19 Notice of Funding Availability process have not been determined, the Children's Cabinet is establishing an application process that is both rigorous and equitable.

2. From page 6: ***"A jurisdiction may be eligible for a percentage of the available competitive funds if it earns a minimum ranking of 91 points or 'Excellent' on its application."*** Is there any chance to appeal or defend a score if a Local Management Board believes it deserves a better score than the score assigned?

There is no appeal or reconsideration of the review process or the scores assigned by the Review Team.

3. From page 11: ***"The Office, in collaboration with the Children's Cabinet, will coordinate efforts to address these initiatives at the State level, but a successful response also requires collaboration and program support at the local level, particularly in those communities most impacted by the challenges experienced by the Strategic Goal populations."*** Is there an ordered list(s) of the communities most impacted by the challenges experienced by the Strategic Goal populations?

The communities should be identified by data and through the Local Management Board's planning processes.

4. From page 12, regarding Disconnected/Opportunity Youth: ***"Most funded programs/strategies will address either the Result of "Youth Will Complete School..." I don't understand how a strategy can address that Result if funded strategies cannot support a client population that is attending school.***

The goal of addressing disconnected youth is to help them find a pathway to employment or education. A funded strategy for disconnected youth that addresses the Result of "Youth Will Complete School" would reconnect an out-of-school youth with a program that results in educational credentials, such as re-engagement with their home school, alternative or adult education, or post-secondary.

5. **We fund a strategy in our County with County funds that would most likely not meet the criteria of a program that would impact the Reduce Childhood Hunger Strategic Goal (backpack program). This is an important strategy for one of our Commissioners and some connected people in the community. However, when doing our local assessment of the priority areas, based on need and community feedback, the Local Management Board has prioritized two Strategic Goals - Improve Outcomes for Disconnected/Opportunity Youth and Reduce the Impact of Incarceration on Children, Families, and Communities. Since the County is funding a strategy that is related to a Strategic Goal, will the Children's Cabinet allow flexibility for the Local Management Board to use the same amount of funding for a program that is a priority, but not necessarily a Strategic Goal?**

The Local Management Board's application must build on the community planning process to implement programs/strategies that address critical needs as identified in the community plan. A program/strategy that has not been identified as a critical need and/or a prioritized result/indicator/Strategic Goal cannot be funded.

6. **Regarding competitive funding discussions for multi-jurisdictional plans as discussed on page 18, if multiple Local Management Boards decide to join together on a multi-jurisdictional effort and one Local Management Board's score does not meet the criteria, does that mean the entire project will be denied? Or will there be a chance to rework the request with only the Local Management Boards who met the criteria?**

For multi-jurisdictional projects proposed for Competitive Funding, a project is not eligible for a portion of the funding if any Board participating has an individual score of 70 or lower. In addition, the average score of the Boards participating must be at least 91 points or the average individual score of 50% of the Boards participating must be at least 91 points.

While we are encouraging multi-jurisdictional proposals, we also want Boards to pay close attention to the quality of their individual proposals. The process that we have established would allow a Board with a strong proposal to partner with Boards that receive a lower score, but not one that has an unresponsive proposal. This is not intended to be a negotiated application process, so we will not rework a request with a Board.

7. **Regarding competitive funding discussions for multi-jurisdictional plans as discussed on page 18, the third and fourth bullets state:**
- ***The average individual score of each Board participating must be at least 91 points to be eligible for a portion of the competitive funds; or***
 - ***The average individual score of 50% of the Boards participating must be at least 91 points.***

I don't understand why both bullets are included.

Thank you for pointing this out! This is a mistake in the Notice of Funding Availability and will be corrected to state:

Competitive Funding:

- A Board with an individual score lower than 91 points may not be the lead for a multi-jurisdictional project receiving competitive funding;
- A multi-jurisdictional project is not eligible for a portion of the competitive funding if any Board participating has an individual score of 70 or lower; and
- The average score of the Boards participating must be at least 91 points to be eligible for a portion of the competitive funds; or
- The individual score of 50% of the Boards participating must be at least 91 points.

- 8. Regarding the “Evidence of Effectiveness” from page 23 (in the *Description of all Proposed Programs/Strategies* bullet), it states: “For an existing program/strategy, this will be demonstrated through a brief summary of no less than three (3) years of the program/strategy’s prior performance measures which must include FY15-FY16 performance measure data currently displayed in the Results Scorecard.” What will determine whether a performance measure shows improvement for the program? We have several programs that have improved so much over the years, but have plateaued. Because we are only using the last three years of data, one not familiar with the project would not know where the program started or that it is now maintaining a positive outcome. Does the Office recognize that performing at a high level without a marked increase is acceptable?**

The Board is not restricted to only showing 3-5 years of data; this is the minimum that must be included. The Board may include as many additional years as they want to demonstrate a program’s successes.

- 9. Will each member of the review team review and score all the applications?**

Similar to the process last year, the reviewers will be grouped by team to review a set of applications and then all reviewers will meet to assess all 24 proposals.

- 10. How should we handle budgets for new programs that will not yet be through the RFP process at time of application since typically vendors submit budgets with their proposal?**

The Local Management Board can use historical information to prepare a prospective budget for the application that can be changed prior to the execution of the Community Partnership Agreement contract or modified after the Agreement is signed.

- 11. Are appendixes C, D, E, and F required forms for the NOFA or just planning tools that we can utilize as needed as long as we communicate the required information?**

Appendixes C, D, E, and F are not required for the application, but are tools and resources that the Board may utilize in developing the application.

- 12. Are LMB’s required to fund a Local Access Mechanism or is it optional?**

There is no requirement to fund any component of a Local Access Mechanism.