An Analysis of Capacity Issues within the Division of Mental and Behavioral Health for the State of Nevada

Jeffrey Buchwald
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Tara Cooley
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Enrique Mazon Jr.
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Jessica Sifuentes
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations

Part of the Health Policy Commons, Public Administration Commons, and the Public Affairs Commons

Repository Citation
Buchwald, Jeffrey; Cooley, Tara; Mazon, Enrique Jr.; and Sifuentes, Jessica, "An Analysis of Capacity Issues within the Division of Mental and Behavioral Health for the State of Nevada" (2014). UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones. 2233.
https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/2233

This Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Scholarship@UNLV. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.
An Analysis of Capacity Issues within the Division of Mental and Behavioral Health

for the State of Nevada

By

Jeffrey Buchwald, Tara Cooley, Enrique Mazon Jr. and Jessica Sifuentes

An Applied Research Project

(PUA 729)

Submitted to the School of Environmental and Public Affairs

University of Nevada Las Vegas

In Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Public Administration

Faculty Approval:

____________________

Jaewon Lim, Ph.D

____________________

Christopher Stream, Ph.D
Executive Summary

Background

Nevada’s competitiveness in receiving federal funding has been a serious and contentious topic that has steered recent efforts to ascertain ways the state can increase and utilize federal dollars efficiently. Nevada is positioned 53rd out of 53 U.S. states and territories in bringing federal dollars to the state, missing out on $1.5 billion annually (Gustafson, 2012). Nevada spends far less on Medicaid (per capita) than any other state. Medicaid is a key factor in improving Nevada’s position; however, there are additional non-formula funding opportunities that are missed every year.

Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation project is to identify infrastructural factors that are impacting Nevada’s performance in receiving federal funding, specifically, the lack of capacity to apply for grants and manage awarded funds.

The review of capacity includes:

- Qualified, competent staff
- Sustainable infrastructure
- Collaborative partnerships
- Appropriate evaluation plans
- Effective data tracking systems

Methodology

In order to identify areas within the State that are contributing to Nevada’s current position, a conjunction of quantitative and qualitative research methods were used. A survey was developed to identify ways for Nevada to increase competitiveness in procurement of federal funds.

In addition to the survey, interviews were conducted with key staff members within the Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health to further analyze the survey results. Lastly, a benchmark study highlighted regional and turn around states (states making significant improvement in a short period of time) in order to identify their approaches that may be successfully adopted in Nevada.
Key Findings

Survey

- Employees across the state feel that their agencies or departments are not doing enough to secure grant funding.
- Majority of respondents (89%) want their agencies to go after more funding.
- Majority of respondents (79%) said the state can do more to secure federal grants.
- More than two-thirds of respondents (70%) feel some level of confidence that they will receive a grant for which they have applied.
- Most common suggestion of respondents (36.5%) suggested adding new staff to alleviate some of the headaches of applying for and managing grants.
- One respondent with the title of Grant Writer secured 86% of the grants he submitted.
- Survey respondents shared concern that a lack of infrastructure is currently holding back the grant application and management process.
- The processes to apply for and manage grants can be overwhelming, especially for some of the smaller offices without proper personnel.

Interviews

- Restructuring of DPBH led to a loss of staff and resources that limits grant applications and grant management capabilities.
- Limited resources and staff is the biggest roadblock to maximizing federal funding.
- Writing the grant does have its challenges, but the greater challenge is implementing the grant.
- Partnerships with community agencies increase grant applications and improve the grant management process within Mental Health.
- The lengthy process at the department level to process paperwork and receive approvals to fulfill grant requirements has a negative impact on the outcome of the grant.

State Comparison

- Organization structure and the distribution of resources to support grant application activities vary by state.
- Limited correlation was found between the strategy used to organize capacity resources and federal funding performance due to limited data availability on federal funding received excluding Medicaid awards at state level.
- The state with the most useful tools and resources to support the procurement of Federal funds is the State of Maryland with its Governor’s Grants Office (GGO).
Recommendations

Policy

- Establish policies that facilitate the completion of grant applications by one person or one agency to minimize the time and resources utilized.

- Establish a Southern Nevada Regional Grants Procurement, Coordination and Management office, to complement the Northern Nevada Grants Procurement, Coordination and Management Office to further increase its reach and capacity in assisting all Nevada agencies and higher education/research institutions. With this expansion, the regional offices should also establish a cooperative partnership with the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE).

- Provide the necessary resources to agencies to meet the requirement (NRS 232.225): Inform the Grant Management Office of the intent to submit a grant; provide the application after submission; and provide a copy of the Notice of Grant Award (NOGA) or denial of funding.

- Clearly define ‘intent’ and establish date expectations after submission and for proof of award or denial.

- Implement accountability standards to ensure consistent reporting from all state agencies.

- Mandate the selection and use of data tracking systems within each agency.

- Leverage expertise housed within the NSHE to increase the production of competitive grant applications in a collaborative fashion to include those experts from various research disciplines.

Future Evaluation

- Conduct a study comparing centralized state driven grant offices versus states utilizing alternative methods. Analyze the federal dollar amounts secured by state over a long-term period.

- Analyze policies in other states that minimize requirements and approvals which exist at the division level to reduce additional delays that negatively impact grants application, management and performance.

- Evaluate the long-term value of grant writers at the state level (Grant Management Office) versus additional staff at the division level.

The ideal amount of federal funding per state is debatable, but clearly Nevada’s current position in federal funding is concerning. The first step to increasing Nevada’s competitiveness is to establish policies that provide infrastructure and performance tracking capabilities. Prior to the implementation of policies to increase grant applications, the state should focus on improving strategies to manage current grant programs. Policy transitions to increase competitiveness should minimize the potential negative impact on employee work performance as much as possible to reduce the loss of historical knowledge, staff turnover and established infrastructure within divisions to prepare and monitor grants.
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1. Introduction & Background

The federal government distributes approximately 17 percent (600 billion) of its annual budget in grants to state and local government (Gordon, 2013). Nevada has consistently struggled to be competitive in obtaining federal grant funding. Ranking last out of all 50 U.S. states in bringing federal dollars in, the state leaves $1.5 billion behind (Gustafson, 2014). In response to Nevada’s dire inability to secure federal sources of revenue, state leadership established the Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management during the 2011 legislative session to address “Nevada’s performance, in the federal, corporate and private grant arenas” (About Nevada Grant Office, 2014).

Through a collaborative effort among the state’s stakeholders, a report by Strategic Progress LLC found that Nevada has to address three fundamental hurdles to turn around its inability to leverage federal funding: 1) Its lack of Medicaid spending; 2) Its structural incompatibility that hinders federal dollars coming into the State; 3) Its lack of capacity within all levels of government to competently secure and efficiently manage the federal funding. In partnership with Accelerate Nevada, this report focuses on further analysis of Strategic Progress’ third factor: Lack of Capacity. “There is a lack of qualified, highly experienced grant writers and grant administrators across the state to design and implement new program models that will be competitive and sustainable” (Gustafson, 2014).

The purpose of this research project is to identify key roadblocks in Nevada’s infrastructure systems as it relates to capacity in securing and properly maintaining federal grants. In addition, this research will examine specific funding channels of discretionary, formula and block grants that Nevada lagged behind on and compare the amount of federal dollars to its neighboring southwestern states in these respective funding categories. This
endeavor will attempt to articulate the lack of funding in these areas. Figure 1.1 reflects the consolidated federal funding report on expenditures per capita in each state.

![Federal Grant Expenditures Per Capita by State (2010)](image)

*Graph produced by Strategic Progress LLC: Competing for Federal Dollars, 2014
Data Source: U.S. Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Consolidated Federal Funds Report for FY 2010

**Figure 1.1: Federal Grant Expenditures Per Capita by State (2010)**

As the figure shows, the average U.S. federal grant funding per capita totaled approximately $2,000. A key factor that was discovered in the study by Strategic Progress that also highlights Nevada’s lack of leveraging funding was its reduced spending on Medicaid. Nevada spends far less on Medicaid (per capita) than any other state. Approximately $1 billion of Nevada’s missed funding is attributed to missed Medicaid dollars (Gustafson, 2014).
In light of this, Medicaid becomes one of several core areas in solving the state’s position in obtaining federal grants. There are various strategies states can utilize to maximize Medicaid including expanding program eligibility and services. Nevada is one of 26 states participating in the Affordable Care Act Medicaid expansion (The Daily Briefing/ Primers, 2014). As of January 1, 2014, Nevada is expanding Medicaid coverage to low-income adults (Medicaid By State, 2014). This increase in Nevada’s spending is sure to lead to increased funds from the federal government. Beyond Medicaid, there are still significant federal funding opportunities that are missed in Nevada. In order for Nevada to become more competitive in federal funding, the barriers preventing Nevada’s success need to be determined. This report focuses on determining the obstacles beyond Medicaid that are impacting the lack of federal funding received.
Research Purpose

In a study conducted by the George Washington Institute of Public Policy, Nevada ranks 49th of 50 in “local government structural and functional responsibility, and legal scope” (Wolman, 2008). Often grant funds are unused and returned due to the inability to manage grant funds (Gustafson, 2014). The required capacity to apply for and receive federal grant funding in Nevada does not exist. Nevada needs a sustainable infrastructure to increase competitiveness. Gustafson reported that many organizations expressed frustration about the level of administrative, evaluation and reporting requirements that accompany Federal funding, resulting in an attitude that federal funding is not worth applying for. One of the objectives of this report is to further investigate the attitudes of Nevada employees who participate in the federal grant process to determine ongoing obstacles that currently exist.

Moreover, this report also aims to identify other capacity factors that are limiting Nevada’s competitiveness in receiving federal funding. Capacity factors include a qualified and competent staff, a sustainable infrastructure, collaborative partnerships, grant management resources evaluation and data tracking systems (Gustafson, 2012). This report includes a benchmark study of Nevada’s federal grant success compared to other states. The data collected is from the Federal consolidated reports comparing Federal funding received by state from 2008-2010. The study includes an outline of strategies used in various states that may be successfully implemented in Nevada. A survey was developed and distributed to various employees within Nevada including local and state employees, individuals from the nonprofit sector, and grant-writing partners. The goal of the survey was to analyze individual attitudes regarding the difficulty to apply for, receive, and manage grant funds. In addition, interviews were conducted with Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health employees who are heavily involved with
the grant application process to determine structural issues that currently exist. A comparison of grant management offices per state is included to identify strategies for continued growth and improvement of Nevada’s Grant Management office.

This report includes a review of the most prevalent capacity issues currently facing Nevada utilizing quantitative and qualitative analysis. Based on the findings, multiple recommendations are offered to increase Nevada’s competitiveness in federal funding. The recommendations include suggestions for the restructuring and improvement of current procedures, staffing structure and systems impacting the success of grant application completion, rewards, and the administration of received funds. In addition, recommendations are included for the expansion of programs and introduction of new systems in Nevada that will support increased federal grant funding.

2. Research Methodology

In order to identify areas within the State that are lacking in regards to securing federal grant funding, a conjunction of quantitative and qualitative research methods were used. A survey was implemented that consisted of mostly quantitative questions with a small amount of qualitative inquiries. In addition, interviews were conducted with key staff members with significant impact on the grant procurement process. The combination of these two approaches will help determine in what areas the State needs improvement.

2.1 Survey

A survey was developed using Qualtrics to help assess what areas within the State need improvement in regards to federal grant funding. Respondents were also asked their opinions on
some of these topics and their recommendations for a solution. The survey was distributed through the Division of Public and Behavioral Health as well as several contacts at other organizations obtained by Strategic Progress. Recipients of the survey were also instructed to forward to any others they may feel have valuable input regarding this issue.

The survey was developed with four different versions or blocks to apply questions to the appropriate audiences. The first block, the default question block, was asked to all respondents. This includes all employees of the State of Nevada, local and municipal government employees, contracted consultants of the state of Nevada, and other entities such as non-profit organizations and institutions of higher education. Three additional question blocks were asked to specific groups, State of Nevada employees within the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, contracted State consultants, and government employees (i.e. county, local and municipal, State employees outside of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health). Respondents that did not fall into these three categories were only asked questions from the default question block.

The majority of the questions are quantitative and help establish patterns among respondents. Many have numerical responses, which have been statistically analyzed.

Examples of data received by these questions include:

- Identifying information (i.e. agency worked, job title)
- Length of time in current position
- Time spent procuring grants
- Time spent managing grants
- Length of time to complete grant application
- Number of grants written
- Number of grants successfully procured
- Missed grant opportunities
State consultants, or grant-writing partners, were asked to quantify the amount of federal grant money procured as well as the number of departments within the State they have assisted. Division of Public and Behavioral Health Employees were asked the length of their employment with the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. All government employees outside of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health were also asked length of employment.

In addition to the quantitative questions, respondents are also asked to rank certain statements regarding their agency/partner and their feelings and attitudes toward grants. This section also allowed for respondents to explain their answers and offer potential solutions. Grant-Writing Partners were asked if they have sufficient control over the process and whether or not they feel they are properly prepared by the State to procure grants on their behalf. Division of Public and Behavioral Health Employees were asked their opinion on the Nevada Grants Office and grant-writing partners’ participation in the process. They were also asked to rank, in their opinions, obstacles to Nevada receiving increased federal grant funding. This section also allowed for comments and respondents to explain their answers. All government employees outside of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health were also asked to rank roadblocks to Nevada receiving increased federal grant funding. Additionally, comments and suggestions were also solicited in this section.

2.2 Interviews

An interview was conducted with staffs from within the Division of Public and Behavioral Health that are integral in the grant procurement process. These individuals were asked several questions from the survey but asked to further elaborate. These interviews differ
from the surveys in that follow-up questions can be asked based on their responses to certain questions without the same parameters as the survey.

An additional interview was conducted with Mary Wherry, the Deputy of Clinical Services at the Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health. The following questions were asked:

- What are the division’s grant goals?
- What are the attitudes of staff members who are involved in the grant application process?
- How does your agency learn about the grants for which it applies?
- Do you have staff exclusively assigned to researching, writing, and administering grants?
- Do you think you are applying for the right amount/ right type of grants?
- If your agency knew of a relative grant but didn’t apply for it, why didn’t your agency apply?
- Why are you not receiving some grants?
- What is your success in administering the grants you receive?
- Do you have a grant tracking system? Is it a software product designed for grant writing and tracking?
- Do you have goals/ strategies in place to improve the grant process?
- How can the State of Nevada Office of Grant Management best assist your agency to acquire grants?
3. Findings/Results

This section takes an analytical look at the data collected over the course of this project. The first part looks at responses from the survey, question by question, and how those data relate to the understanding of the Division of Public and Behavioral Health’s capacity for receiving and managing federal grants. The second part focuses on the post-survey interviews conducted with selected current and former members of the DPBH to gain more insight into some of the survey’s findings. Third is the benchmark study, which is an examination of Nevada’s ability to secure federal dollars as compared to other states (minus Medicaid funding). Finally, this section looks at regional and comparison states, selected due to their successes in securing federal funding via grants.

3.1 Survey Results

The results of the survey are below. Questions are written in the order they appear on the survey itself. The notation after the question name (Q1, etc) indicates the order in which the question was added to the survey. This was not done by design, but added automatically by Qualtrics. Both the question name and notation are necessary due to the way the Qualtrics exports data.

- **Common questions (available to all respondents)**

  A total of seventeen common questions were asked to all the respondents. These questions were designed to identify types of experience, responsibility and institutions for which the respondents are working, and further utilize these characteristics for the analysis of survey results.
• **Question 1 (Q1): For what type of agency/organization do you work?**

  o **Results:** Respondents were given the opportunity to pick from the following choices: State of Nevada (Division of Public and Behavioral Health); State of Nevada (Other); County; Local/Municipality; State Consultants; Other, including an open text field to allow the user a chance to explain their answer further. Thirty-four respondents (42%) chose the State of Nevada (Division of Public and Behavioral Health). Nine (11%) chose State of Nevada (Other). Seven (9%) chose County. Nine (11%) chose the county. No respondent chose State Consultants. Twenty-two respondents (27%) chose other. Of those, we had twelve people (54%) from non-profits, four in education (18%), four (18%) chose not to respond, one bank employee and one independent contractor.

  o **Interpretation:** While the capstone group assigned to collected and analyze these data, Herbs and Omnis Consulting (H&O Consulting) anticipated that most responses would come from the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, it was disappointing that the group did not receive a single response from the state’s grant-writing partners. The survey had an entire section for the grant-writing partners, so H&O Consulting will not be able to cross-reference the responses of the Division employees against the responses of the grant-writing partners. Further, the survey included a section of questions specifically for the grant-writing partners, and as such, there will be no data for those questions.

*Graph 3.1*
Question 2 (Q2): What is your job title?

- **Results:** Respondents were given the opportunity to pick from the following choices: Grants Administrator; Project Manager; Project Coordinator; Other, including an open text field to allow the user a chance to explain their answer further. Nine people (11%) chose Grants Administrator. Sixteen respondents (20%) chose Project Manager. Seven people (9%) chose Project Coordinator. Forty-nine people (60%) chose other, and there were a wide range of job titles listed. There were five directors, four executive directors, one deputy executive director, one assistant director, and one senior vice president, totaling twelve responses (24%) from senior/executive level employees. Other responses include: case manager, chief biostatistician, clinical program manager, community health nurse manager, development analyst, epidemiologist, fund development coordinator, grant writer, grant analyst, health program manager, health resource analyst, housing specialist, human and health services w/grants, juvenile justice specialist, mental health counselor, MHT, program manager, psychotherapist, QA manager, QA specialist, recovery services coordinator, redevelopment manager, section manager, senior research associate, senior services supervisor, specialist, professor, and seven non-responders.

- **Interpretation:** These data indicate that a wide variety of people/jobs are involved in the grant writing process and there does not seem to be a standard across different disciplines. H&O Consulting’s ability to lock down exactly what types of jobs are performing grant writing-related duties will be severely limited.

Question 3 (Q3): How long (in years) have you been employed in your current position?

- **Results:** The respondents were presented with a sliding scale, from 0 to 50, where they could indicate how long they have been working in their current capacity. Responses ranged from zero to twenty-six years, with thirteen (16%) abstentions.

- **Interpretation:** These data will be useful in later analysis.
Table 3.1
How long (in years) have you been employed in your current position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.0147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.2
How long (in years) have you been employed in your current position? - Numer of years

How long (in years) have you been employed in your current position? - Numer of years
• **Question 4 (Q4): What percentage of your time are you required to spend in procuring grants?**

  o **Results:** The respondents were presented with a sliding scale, from 0 to 100, where they could indicate how long they have been working in their current capacity. Responses ranged from zero to 100, with eleven (14%) abstentions.

  o **Interpretation:** These data will be useful in later analysis.

**Table 3.2**
What percentage of your time are you required to spend in procuring grants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.9571</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graph 3.3**

**What percentage of your time are you required to spend in procuring grants?**

![Bar graph showing the distribution of time spent on procuring grants.](graph_url)
• **Question 5 (Q31): What percentage of your time do you spend in procuring grants?**

  o **Results:** Respondents were once again presented with a sliding scale from 0 to 100. Thirty three people indicated they spend less than 10% of their time procuring grants, and sixty four indicated something below 50%. Only one said they spend 100% of their time procuring grants. Again, there were eleven (14%) abstentions.

  o **Interpretation:** The one person who said they spend 100% of their time procuring grants said their job title is Program Manager. This is perhaps indicative of someone whose position is grant-funded, thus they would be more apt to spend their time with the grant process. One has to wonder, though, if personal survival is the sole reason for spending so much time with this process.

*Table 3.3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What percentage of your time do you spend in procuring grants?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.4

What percentage of your time do you spend in procuring grants? - Percentage of time

- Question 6 (Q5): What percentage of your time are you required to spend managing grants?

  - Results: Respondents were once again presented with a sliding scale from 0 to 100. Four people said they are required to spend 100% of their time managing grants. Eighteen said that less than 10% of their time should be spend managing grants, and forty-three said that number is under 50%. This time, twelve people (15%) abstained.
  - Interpretation: There are very few people who answered this survey who indicated they are responsible for both procuring grants and managing those grants once the funding has been received. This should indicate that there is a good specialization
amongst employees who will do either the procurement or the managing, and that no one person is being given an overwhelming amount of responsibility when it comes to the grant process within a given office.

Table 3.4
What percentage of your time are you required to spend managing grants?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.7101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>25.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.5
What percentage of your time are you required to spend managing grants?
- Percentage of time

What percentage of your time are you required to spend managing grants?
- Percentage of time
• **Question 7 (Q32): What percentage of your time do you spend managing grants?**

  o **Results:** Again, using a sliding scale, respondents were able to pick between 0 and 100. Three people indicated that they spend 100% of their time managing grants. Twenty-eight (35%) said they spend at least half their time managing grants, and there were twelve (15%) abstentions.

  o **Interpretation:** Comparing how people answered this question (Q32) to the previous question (Q5), the group was able to tell the difference between expectations and reality. In a vast majority of cases, people indicated that they were spending roughly as much time as required in managing grants. In only rare cases did someone indicate a large disparity between the two figures. For example, one respondent said they are required to spend 5% of their time managing grants, but in reality, they are spending 70% of their time in the management process. A handful of others indicated a discrepancy of about 30%, but the rest were more or less where they should be.

  Table 3.5
  What percentage of your Time do you spend managing grants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.3913</td>
<td>40.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.6

**Question 8 (Q6): On average, how long (in days) does it take for you to complete an application for a grant upon receiving notice of the grant?**

- **Results:** Respondents were given a sliding scale, from 0 to 180. Answers ranged from zero to 90 with twelve abstentions. Fourteen people (17%) indicated five or fewer days.

- **Interpretation:** From a statistical analysis standpoint, there is not much here in the way of finding concrete data on which to base any kind of decision. However, it is interesting to see the varying times people spend in writing these grant applications. Future studies may to want to ask the tangentially-related question “How many people are involved in the writing of your grants?”
Table 3.6
On average, how long (in days) does it take for you to complete an application for a grant upon…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.9710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>27.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.7
On average, how long (in days) does it take for you to complete an application for a grant upon...
• **Question 9 (Q7): In an average year, how many grant applications do you write?**

  o **Results:** Respondents were able to pick from a sliding scale of 0 to 300. Answers ranged from 0 to 177 with thirteen (16%) abstentions. The highest response (177) was more than three times the next greatest answer (50).

  o **Interpretation:** The highest response was given by the only person to indicate a job title of Grant Writer. Other job titles with more than 20 grant applications in an average year are Grants Director, Executive Director, Fund Development Coordinator and Grants Administrator. The data show that the Grant Writer was the most efficient and effective at writing grants. However, that is probably due to the employee having no tasks other than writing the grant applications. The other respondents have job titles that indicate they have other responsibilities, thus they must do a better job finding time to apply for grants.

*Table 3.7*  
In an average year, how many grant applications do you write?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.1618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Graph 3.8*
• **Question 10 (Q8): In an average year, how many grants to you successfully procure?**

  o **Results:** Respondents were able to pick from a sliding scale of 0 to 300. Answers ranged from 0 to 152 with thirteen (16%) abstentions. Only ten respondents (12%) indicated a double-digit number, while twelve (15%) said they receive zero grants per year.

  o **Interpretation:** The Grant Writer received 152 of 177, or almost 86% of all applications are received. Having a dedicated grant writer within the department seems to have a profound effect on the number of grants received. Interestingly, the Epidemiologist was a perfect 12 for 12. While this person can certainly be more selective in which grants to select, a 100% rate of return is remarkable. Graph 3.9 gives the full range of responses to this question. Graph 3.10 compares this question (Q8) to the previous question (Q7).

**Table 3.8**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In an average year, how many grants do you successfully procure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.9

In an average year, how many grants do you successfully procure? - Number of grants
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- Q7_1 In an average year, how many grant applications do you write? - Number of grant applications
- Q8_1 In an average year, how many grants do you successfully procure? - Number of grants
• *Question 11 (Q9): In an average year, how many grants would you have liked to apply for but were unable?*

  o **Results:** Respondents were able to pick from a sliding scale of 0 to 300. Answers ranged from 0 to 99. Twelve people (15%) answered zero, twenty four (30%) people gave a number of ten or higher, and thirteen (16%) did not answer the question.

  **Interpretation:** People are aware that grants are out there for the taking, and that federal money is available. A majority of respondents indicated that they were unable to apply for grants, which indicates a willingness to go through the grant application process as well as the management of said grant once it has been awarded. Thus we understand that the respondents of this survey will likely be receptive to the idea of going after more grants in the future.

*Table 3.9*

In an average year, how many grants would you have liked to apply for but were unable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.8088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 3.11
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- Question 12 (Q29): In an average year, how many grants do you apply for but don’t receive?
  
  - Results: Respondents were given a sliding scale and were asked to choose a number between 0 and 300. Answers ranged from 0 to 25. Only eight respondents (10%) said they applied for but did not receive ten or more grants. Thirteen people (16%) abstained from responding.
  
  - Interpretation: There are some odd data here. Twenty four people (30%) indicated zero, meaning they were getting 100% of the grants for which they applied. But based on their previous answers to Q7 and Q8, this was not the case. Four of these people indicated they applied for grants (Q7) but did not receive them (Q8). There
are other irregularities between their answers to Q7 and Q8 compared to Q29. H&O Consulting recommends eliminating these data from the final report.

Table 3.10
In an average year, how many grants do you apply for but don't receive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.1765</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 3.12
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Question 13 (Q10): Would you like to see your agency/partner apply for more grants?

- **Results:** Respondents were given a “Yes/No” option. Of these, there were only nine of 81 respondents (11%) who said “No”.

- **Interpretation:** For H&O Consulting, this was the single most important question of the survey. The project began with the assumption that the Division of Public and Behavioral Health wanted to apply for more grants. But without knowing the climate of the office as a whole, it would be difficult to recommend applying for more grants without getting buy-in from the department. Fortunately for the Division, 82% of the employees surveyed were in favor of bringing in more grant money, thus initial buy-in is quite high (Graph 3.13). There is an opportunity here for the Division to educate those who said “No” about the importance of grants if they so choose.

**Graph 3.13**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For what type of agency/organization do you work:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to see your agency/partner apply for more grants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to see your agency/partner apply for more grants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Nevada (Division of Public and Behavioral Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Nevada (Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/ Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
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**Question 14 (Q11): Why or why not?**

- **Results**: This was an open-ended question where the respondent was allowed to say as much or as little as they wanted in regards to grants. Five respondents (6%) provided non-answers such as “N/A”.

- **Interpretation**: The full list of responses compared to how they answered the previous question (Q10) can be found in Appendix A. Typically, those who wanted the agency to apply for more grants recognized the importance of having an additional source of funding. The biggest complaint amongst those who did not want more grants was the capacity to manage the grants once the funding was awarded. In many cases, they do not have sufficient staff to handle the additional funds or tasks.

**Question 15 (Q18): In your opinion, does the State do enough to secure grants?**

- **Results**: Respondents were given a “Yes/No” option. Of these, eighteen of 81 respondents (22%) said “Yes”.

- **Interpretation**: Fifteen of the eighteen people (83%) who said “Yes” also said “Yes” to Q10 – that they want their agency to apply for more grants. It was beyond the scope of this research, but a follow-up question may entail “If you want the state to apply for more grants, but feel the state is already doing enough, what would you recommend the state do to secure more grants?”

*Graph 3.14*
• **Question 16 (Q19): What more could be done to help secure more grants?**

  o **Results:** This question was only answerable by those who indicated “No” on the previous question (Q18).
  
  o **Interpretation:** The full results are posted in Appendix B. The overwhelming response was to bring on a full-time grant writer (or writers). Previous data in this survey indicated that a full-time grant writer was able to process three times as many grants as any other responder, and they had over an 85% success rate in obtaining grants.

• **Question 17 (Q12): Please rate the following statements:**

  - Q12_1: When applying, I feel confident I will receive a grant.
  
  - Q12_2: My agency/partner gives me appropriate time to apply for grants.
  
  - Q12_3: My agency/partner mobilizes quickly to be competitive in procuring grants.
  
  - Q12_4: My agency/partner give me appropriate resources to apply for grants (i.e. grant writers, matching funds, training, etc).
  
  - Q12_5: I feel my agency/partner has the appropriate resources to apply for grants (i.e. grant writers, matching funds, training, etc).
  
  - Q12_6: I feel my agency/partner values the importance of grants.
  
  - Q12_7: I am optimistic about the future of my agency/partner receiving grants.
  
  - Q12_8: I feel my agency/partner is prepared to respond to RFPs when announced.

  o **Results:** Respondents were given eight statements related to the grant process and asked to rank their feelings based on a six point Likert scale. The statements were –
  
  o **Interpretation:** The scale given to the respondents: Strongly Disagree; Disagree; Somewhat Disagree; Somewhat Agree; Agree; Strongly Agree. H&O Consulting made a conscious effort to leave off a “Neutral” or “No opinion option” to force the respondents to pick a side. For Q12_1, the feelings were optimistic. A majority of those surveyed indicate they are confident they will receive the grants for which they apply. The second and third questions also garnered a positive response. People agreed more than they disagreed about their agencies or partners giving them
appropriate time to apply for grants, as well as moving quickly to secure these grants. The following two questions deal with resources to apply for grants, and the tone has shifted. People were less optimistic and nearly 2/3 of respondents for both questions said they did not feel the agency or partners had appropriate resources. This matches the expectations H&O Consulting had when drafting the survey. Respondents overwhelmingly said they feel their agency or partner values the importance of grants, and that they are optimistic about their agency’s future in regards to grants. The final question also had an optimistic view, though not as overwhelming as the previous two questions. People did seem to believe that their agency or partner is prepared to respond to RFPs when they are announced, but other data from the survey suggest that being prepared to respond to an RFP and actually having the resources to be able to respond to an RFP are two different things. A follow-up question may want to reflect that disconnect. Full responses are listed in Appendix C.

This was the final question available to all survey participants. There were three additional sections for employees of the Grant Writing Partners (0), the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (34), and for other public employees (25).

**Questions for Grant-writing partners**

The following questions were reserved for those respondents who indicated they worked with one of the state’s grant-writing partners:

- **Question 18 (Q13): Have you secured federal funding for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health within the last 12 months? If yes, please indicate amount.**

- **Question 19 (Q14): How many departments have you assisted in procuring grants?**

- **Question 20 (Q16): Do you have sufficient control over the grant application process?**
- **Question 21 (Q17): Do you have access to necessary information and documentation to apply for these grants?**

Unfortunately, no respondent to the survey worked for the state’s grant-writing partners. These questions have been left off of the final report.

- **Questions for Division of Public and Behavioral Health Employees**

The following questions were given only to the thirty four respondents who indicated they were employed by the State of Nevada in the Division of Public and Behavioral Health:

  - **Question 22 (Q20): How long (in years) have you been employed in the Division of Public and Behavioral Health?**

    - **Results:** Respondents were given a sliding scale to choose a number between 0 and 50. Answers ranged from one to 14 years, with only six respondents (18%) saying they have worked for the Division for a decade or more. Fourteen respondents (41%) were in their first three years of employment.

    - **Interpretation:** H&O Consulting attempted to reach employees with a wide breadth of experience working for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health. The expectation is that the number of years employed should affect the employee’s attitude in future questions.

| N Valid | 34 |
| Missing | 47 |
| Mean    | 5.5000 |
| Median  | 5.0000 |
| Mode    | 1.00 |
Question 23 (Q21): Would the Division be better off if the grant writing process was entirely in-house?

- Results: Survey participants were given a choice of “Yes” or “No”. It was a forced-entry question, so no one would be able to abstain. The results were mixed. Nineteen answered “Yes”, fifteen said “No”.

- Interpretation: The data presented here is done as a crosstab with data from the previous question (Q20). These data do not indicate any sort of pattern between number of years in service and attitude towards keeping the grant writing process in-house. The expectation was that the longer the person had been employed by the division, the more likely they would want to keep the grant writing in house. This would allow them to keep more control over the process.
Table 3.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long (in years) have you been employed in the Division of Public and Behavioral Health?</th>
<th>Would the Division be better off if the grant writing process was entirely in-house?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Question 24 (Q22): How important is the Nevada Grants Office to the application process?**
  
  o **Results**: Respondents were given a sliding scale on which they could choose any value between 0 (Not at all important) to 100 (Extremely important). Responses ran the entire gamut of the scale from 0 to 100. Fourteen of the 34 responders (41%) indicated a number of 51 or higher, with six people (18%) choosing to remain neutral at 50.
  
  o **Interpretation**: Again, there seems to be no correlation between this current question and either Q21 or Q20. Responses were all over the place, and a cross tabulation showed no relationship amongst these data. Expectations of finding patterns within these data appear to be incompatible with the evidence.
Question 25 (Q24): Rank the following items in order using 1 to 7 by dragging the choices; 1 being the BIGGEST roadblock to securing grants, 7 being the SMALLEST roadblock.

- Results: Respondents were given seven options from which to choose their biggest obstacles faced when working on grants. The options were:
  - Q24_1: Organizational/Government structure
  - Q24_2: Lack of employee interest
  - Q24_3: Lack of appropriate grants
  - Q24_4: Insufficient staff
  - Q24_5: Lack of experience/knowledge (i.e. training)
  - Q24_6: Missing match funds
  - Q24_7: Lack of collaborative partners
“Organizational/Government structure” barely edged “insufficient staff” as the most popular choice for biggest roadblock, but both choices elicited 23 responses of 1 or 2 (68%). Given that these are the two biggest roadblocks faced by the employees of the Division, suggestions on how to overcome these obstacles will have to be the priority. The next most popular selection was “lack of experience/knowledge (i.e. training)”, garnering nine responses of 1 or 2. Full results are found in Appendix D.

- **Interpretation**: Employees have said their biggest obstacles are both on the state level. First, they are having issues navigating the organizational/governmental structure when it comes to grant writing. So logically, there should be something done about the red tape facing those who wish to go after more grants. If the Nevada Grants Office is seen as an insufficient solution, the Division may want to implement training on how to navigate that red tape. Being able to cut through bureaucracy should help eliminate those issues. Next, the employees say there is insufficient staff. While hiring a full time grant writer for the Division is not currently financially viable, the Division may want to rethink their approach to how this position can be funded. There are grants available that will pay salaries. Otherwise, the Division should look to utilize the Nevada Grants Office (NGO) more thoroughly. Set up regular meetings with the NGO to discuss upcoming opportunities or get updates on the status of current applications. The third most popular roadblock is lack of training. The Division could easily invest in bringing professional grant writers in to the Division to help train employees how to write more competitive grants. They may also want to show people how to find available funding, how to navigate the NGO, or how best to organize the application paperwork so that it has a higher chance of success.

- **Question 26 (Q33): What resources exist within the department to pursue federal funding opportunities?**
  - **Results**: This question was an open-ended text field where the user could input anything they chose. Fourteen respondents (41%) said something along the lines of “None”, “N/A”, “Very little”, etc. Those who indicated some available resources
mentioned the Nevada Grants Office (12%), staff/administration (21%), and outside grant writers/trainings (18%).

- **Interpretation:** All respondents are from within the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, so why the wide breadth of responses? Perhaps the resources exist, but the word isn’t being spread to the right people within the Division. This goes back to the point of collaborating more closely with the Nevada Grants Office for things like training, mentoring, etc. Make sure anyone within the Division has the resources they need, even if that means going to the NGO for help.

- **Question 27 (Q23): Please add any additional roadblocks in securing grants.**

  - **Results:** This question was an open-ended text field where the user could input anything they chose. Ten respondents (29%) wrote “N/A”, “Unknown”, etc. Other popular answers include lack of time (18%), lack of staff (18%), and lack of training or knowledge (18%). The full list of responses can be found in Appendix E.

  - **Interpretation:** While H&O Consulting can make assumptions about why people may or may not be able to secure grants, getting the information directly from the employees in an open text field is key. The employees presented some concepts that had been considered (lack of awareness, for example), but they also brought up points that had not been previously mentioned (lack of support from the fiscal office). For the overall picture within the Division, there are certain things that can be done better, such as training and working with the Nevada Grants Office. But an individualized approach may work for each separate department/sector within the Division. These sectors can identify what problems their specific area faces, and can best work out a solution as to how to tackle these issues.

- **Questions for Public Sector Employees**

  The following questions were given only to the twenty five respondents who indicated they were employed within the public sector at an agency other than the Division of Public and Behavioral Health:
• **Question 28 (Q25): How long (in years) have you been employed in the public sector?**

  o **Results:** Only four people answered this question. They indicated tenures of 7, 8, 15 and 20 years. Two employees work for the state, one for the city and one for the county. This group includes the aforementioned Grant Writer that had been so successful at securing grants (from Q7 and Q8).

  o **Interpretation:** The overall number of public employees who responded to this survey is disappointing, but they were able to give some good feedback in the subsequent questions (Q26 and Q27).

• **Question 29 (Q26): Rank the following items in order using 1 to 7; 1 being the BIGGEST roadblock to securing grants, 7 being the SMALLEST roadblock.**

  o **Results:** This question is a mirror of Q24, given to Division of Public and Behavioral Health employees. The choices were:
    - Q26_1: Organizational/Government structure
    - Q26_2: Lack of employee interest
    - Q26_3: Lack of appropriate grants
    - Q26_4: Insufficient staff
    - Q26_5: Lack of experience/knowledge (i.e. training)
    - Q26_6: Missing match funds
    - Q26_7: Lack of collaborative partners

  o **Interpretation:** Much like the Division of Public and Behavioral Health employees, the other public sector employees identified the Organizational/Government structure as the biggest roadblock with nineteen respondents (76%) answering 1 or 2. Insufficient staff was second, with sixteen respondents (64%) of 1 or 2. Interestingly, fourteen respondents (56%) indicated a 6 or 7 for Lack of employee interest, which shows the various offices have the necessary employee buy-in. The full results can be found in Appendix F.

• **Question 30 (Q27): Please add any additional roadblocks in securing grants.**
Results: This question was an open-ended text field where the user could input anything they chose. Some of the more interesting responses were:

“Support staff is needed for boilerplate and standard tasks such as assembling appendices.”

“State bureaucracy deters a culture of competitiveness. Delays in approval to implement grants. Reduction of general fund when a grant is brought in also deters.”

“There appears to be a lack of understanding of social service grants in my organization and a reticent to applying for grants because of the perceived need to continue the program after grant funding has expired. There have been several grants that have come up that I have not been given approval to apply for. This has resulted in a loss of enthusiasm to apply for extra grants.”

Interpretation: The public sector employees are facing the same issues as the Division employees. It should not be surprising that they are hit with the same bureaucratic red tape when applying for grants. These responses, however, bring up the idea of culture and climate within the office. By not receiving grants, or not getting the approval/enthusiasm to apply for these grants, employees feel like their work may not matter. One employee in the Division brought up the same concept, but it was limited to upper management. The public employee answers indicate that the lack of excitement about grants is more far-reaching. Educating the front-line employees about the importance of grants may not become a priority. The full list of responses can be found in Appendix G.

The results of the survey show that employees across the state feel that their agencies or departments are not doing enough to secure grant funding. On top of that, they want to see their agencies apply for more grants. According to the respondents of the survey, the climate of their respective offices is that of readiness for more grants. A large majority (89%) of all responders said they want their organization to go after more funding. In addition, 79% of all responders said the state can do more to secure these grants, and 70% feel some level of confidence that they
will receive a grant for which they have applied. The willingness, attitude, understanding and need for grants exist across every department that responded to this survey. The missing ingredient, however, is the capacity. So how can these agencies deal with the capacity problems?

Specifically, the Division of Public and Behavioral Health employees are very much on board with getting more grants. As previously mentioned, 82% of respondents who work for the Division of Public and Behavioral Health want to see their employer go after more federal money. When those who work for the Division but did not complete the survey are incorporated into the results that number jumps to nearly 85%. According to the survey results, there are a few suggestions that can be made right away; some given as implicit answers, some implied from the responses received. The Division must now decide the best approach going forward when it comes to the grant writing and procuring process.

First, there is room for improvement when it comes to the climate within the Division. Perhaps getting 100% of the people on board with grants is impossible. However, the holdouts can be educated as to the importance of grants. There are educational opportunities the Division can implement to bring even more people on board with the idea of grants. For some, they see grants as cumbersome and more trouble than they are worth. If the Division can specifically attack and dispel these notions with targeted information, they can bring even more of their employees on board.

There is a concern, however, that some employees may be “too far gone” to be reachable. Some have simply shut off the idea of grants altogether, and cannot be swayed. When the emails regarding the survey were sent, one such employee responded to H&O Consulting with the following:
The Substance Abuse and Treatment Agency has been very successful in applying for and receiving funding from SAMHSA. The reason is that there are three of us who do the work – 2 writers and one budget person. We get no support from Public and Behavioral Health and no recognition or thanks for our efforts. The Division has no formal grant writing group or unit and therefore foregoes most of the opportunities that are available. The two writers in this group are retiring in the next 3 months so there will be no grant writing being done from SAPTA after that. No one else has the knowledge and expertise. And that is not being developed.... but since I am retiring I don’t care!!! What an attitude! But it is true that the Division does not support grant writing in general. That may be changing but there are no moves to do training or recruit employees who have grant-writing expertise.

The Division should be able to recognize and isolate these employees quickly and keep them away from those who may otherwise be open to the grant process. There is a true danger of these kinds of employees tainting those who are going to remain within the Division, thus they could quickly undermine any effort of those who wish to bring more federal money into the state via grants.

Grants are a huge undertaking for any office. Many survey respondents suggested adding new staff would alleviate some of the headaches of applying for and managing grants. These staff members should be dedicated to all aspects of the grant process – from initial application to management to fulfillment, and all aspects in between. While the Nevada Grants Office exists and has some resources to help the Division, it does not have the specific subject expertise needed in some grant applications. Therefore, grant applications can be less impressive than those from other states, or they may be lacking information that would be included by a person with direct knowledge of the subject area.

Along these same lines, another concern expressed by the survey respondents was that of time – both the time it takes to apply for grants and the time that the Nevada Grants Office may or may not have at any given time, and thus may not be able to get the materials submitted in time. It is imperative that all agencies in Nevada, not just the Division of Public and Behavioral
Health, submit grant application packets in time. If the centralized NGO is too busy with grant applications for other offices, the Division’s application will fall by the wayside. The Division can ill-afford to have any application fall through the cracks, thus they must find a way to keep the application process in-house.

This is, of course, a long-term fix that will be best implemented once the state has more adequate funding for these full-time positions. In the meantime, the Division should be able to work something out with the NGO to find dedicated resources within the NGO to focus solely on public health grants. Once funding becomes available, the Division can look to hire a full-time grant coordinator, housed within the Division but acting as a liaison to the NGO. The data from the survey will show exactly how effective a full-time grant writer can be. The statistics were discussed earlier in this report, but the one respondent with the title of Grant Writer was able to write a boatload of grants per year (177) and secured a huge percentage of those grants (152, or 86%). This unbelievable rate of success shows why these grant writers are so important. Allowing one person to focus on the process ensures that the application will be done correctly and on time.

The third major concern of the survey respondents was that of the government structure, essentially meaning red tape. The processes involved to apply for and manage grants can be overwhelming, especially for some of the smaller offices without proper personnel. This maze of bureaucracy can cause serious delays in the application and management processes. The Division of Public and Behavioral Health should work together with the Nevada Grants Office to ensure every part of the grant process is running as smooth as possible. It will require management of both agencies to get together and hammer out the plan, then disseminate that
information down to the people responsible for the grants process. As long as the buy-in exists from both sides, this should mitigate any further delays and streamline the process.

3.2 Interviews

A structured focus group interview with Nevada Mental Health employees Dave Caloiaro and Dr. Luana Ritch and former Mental Health employee Christina Brooks, was completed after the survey results were calculated to uncover more answers regarding roadblocks to Nevada’s procurement of Federal funds. With Nevada’s recent merger of Mental Health and Public Health, Mental Health has moved to Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency (SAPTA).

Focus group interviewees agreed that the transition was the right move, but the unintended consequences of the move is that Mental Health has been left with less staff, twice the work and limited resources. There was a loss of infrastructure to prepare and monitor grants. Caloiaro, Brooks and Ritch agreed that limited resources and staff are the biggest roadblocks to obtaining Federal funding. Writing the grant does have its challenges, but Caloiaro’s team stated that the greater challenge is implementing it. It has only been a year since the transition. Of the few grants Mental Health has applied for they have been very successful in receiving funding. With more staff and resources the division would be likely to receive several more grants each year.

Currently in Mental Health, one team member manages three grants. Another team member manages the Mental Health Block Grant, a noncompetitive grant which is received every year as long as they meet the requirements of the grant. Three employees in Mental Health are not enough to be competitive in receiving Federal funding. SAPTA is currently working on
putting a grants management unit together. Grants are a high priority for staff members. It is their responsibility seeking out additional funding to support their division’s goals. The goal of the Mental Health department if they had enough resources and staff would be to receive one grant a quarter (three to four grants a year). The Mental Health staff agreed that having the grant process completing in house could work well as long as they had enough staffs. They would need at least three people. If the grant is competitive and there are not a lot of funds at stake then the team probably will not apply.

One roadblock that was mentioned was that once you have approval at the Federal level, there are approvals needed at the department level as well. For example, if the grant includes funding for a project manager or includes travel and additional supports, there is a large amount of paperwork and setbacks that utilize valuable times and resources at the division level. This makes it difficult for staff members to stay on top of the requirements of the grant. Sometimes it’s difficult to utilize an outside grant writer (from state or contractor) because they may not have the program knowledge to be successful. This takes additional time and resources from the division’s staff members.

Mental Health has received assistance from other entities in applying for and receiving the grants that they were able to complete this year. Mental Health has little experience in writing grants, but SAPTA has past experience and they are providing assistance and support to the limited Mental Health department. One way that Mental Health is able to provide additional services to the community without applying for and managing grants on their own is by partnering with community providers to apply for and manage the grants. Mental Health supports the community provider by offering a specific service to support the fulfillment of the grant’s requirements. The Nevada Grants Office has been extremely helpful in assisting Mental Health
in the acquisition of more grants for their division. With the help of Sheila Lambert, Mental Health was able to apply for grants this year that without her they never could have. The Grant Management Office informs agencies throughout the state that if there is a specific grant that is crucial to their program that they will assist them in submitting the application.

3.3. Benchmark Study

In order to make Nevada more competitive for federal funding, other states were under review for their approaches to procuring federal grants. As Nevada is ranked lower than almost all other states, regional states with better results as well as states showing improved federal grant procurement results were studied.

Three states within the western region that have been more successful than Nevada at receiving federal grants were studied. The regional comparison states were selected by using the Consolidated Federal Funds Report for fiscal years 2008 through 2010. These are the most recent reports issued by the United States Census Bureau and compare the total amount of federal funding received per capita among all states. Colorado, New Mexico, and Idaho were chosen based on their performance over this time span. In addition to the consolidated Federal Funds Report, data from the Department of Health and Human Services and from the United States Census Bureau regarding Medicaid was factored in. As Medicaid is a formula grant, the amount received per state was subtracted from the total CAN award amount.

In addition to regional neighboring states that have had success in procuring federal funds, three other relatively distant states that showed progress in increasing their amount of federal grant funding were studied. Delaware, Minnesota, and Oregon all showed steady but sound improvement overall. The turnaround comparison states were selected by using the Consolidated Federal Funds Report for fiscal years 2008 through 2010. These are the most
recent reports issued by the United States Census Bureau and compare the total amount of federal funding received per capita among all states. In addition to the consolidated Federal Funds Report, data from the Department of Health and Human Services and from the United States Census Bureau regarding Medicaid was factored in. As Medicaid is a formula grant, the amount received per state was subtracted from the total CAN award amount.

3.4 Comparison of States: A Review of Resources

Nevada is one of only a few U.S. states with Grant Management Offices. Nevada was the first of the regional states to establish one in 2011 and Arizona followed shortly after by establishing a Grant Management office in 2013. Nevada’s Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management is currently focusing on several factors that previous reports have determined as high priority needs to improve Nevada’s position in Federal funding. A lack of data collection and management currently limits research abilities to analyze how successful grant applications are. Pursuant to NRS 232.225, all state agencies are required to inform the Department of Administration, Budget Division, Office of Grant Procurement, Coordination and Management of any grant a State agency applies for, receives, or is not approved for. The first step to increase competitiveness for Nevada is to find out how effective its current efforts are. Few agencies within Nevada have tracked grants that were applied, received or denied. The new tracking of the Office of Grant Management to document all grant efforts within the state will lead to the insight needed to implement policies and strategies that improve Nevada’s performance in receiving Federal funding.

Although the existence of a State Grant Management Office is rare, many states provide tools and resources to support their state’s capacity in receiving and managing Federal funds. Data tracking the total awards received per state from 2008-2010, showed Delaware making the
largest turnaround (United States Census Bureau, 2009). Delaware ranked 44th in total rewards in 2008 and ranked 3rd in 2010, a 41 point increase. The Federal Grants Administration and State Clearinghouse Committee within the Office of Management and Budget carries out similar duties of the Nevada office by establishing goals procedures and guidelines for grant procurement and management as well as requiring agencies to document the grants they apply for and receive (Federal Grants Administration and State Clearinghouse, 2014). In this comparison, Delaware and Nevada have made similar efforts to support their states Federal funding achievements. There are still several undetermined factors that may have impacted Delaware’s major jump in funding from 2008 to 2010. Various state grant writers can access information, training and resources to support their grant procurement and grant management. The most common office to provide grant management support and guidance is the State’s Senator’s office. State of New Mexico, a regional state that had been in the top five all three years (2008-2010) for total Federal funds received, receives grant information, resources and support from Senator Tom Udall’s office (Applying For Grants, 2014). The state found to have the most helpful tools and resources to support the procurement of Federal funds is the State of Maryland. Maryland’s Governor’s Grants Office (GGO), a coordinating agency of the Governor’s office, provides information, training and resources for individuals involved in the Federal grant funding process (Maryland’s Governor’s Grants Office, 2014). Maryland has led grant contracts within each agency and local government. These leaders increase collaboration among agencies within the state to maximize Maryland’s competitiveness. Several states are following Maryland’s model to create a grant management office under the direction of the governor. In 2010, Maryland ranked 16th in Federal grant expenditures. The optimal amount of Federal funding for each state is difficult to determine. In the top 20, Maryland is competitive in
applying for and receiving grant funding without procuring too much federal funding. Nevada needs to develop a new formula that will provide it with similar results.

4. Policy Recommendation

In Nevada, grant writing is completed by employees within the agency, by the NGO and by outside partners. It is clear that Nevada agencies need additional human resources to complete more grant applications; however, there is not a best practice across the state defining who should complete the applications. Structural guidelines are needed to clarify the most efficient and effective process. Policies are needed that facilitate the completion of grant applications that minimize the time and resources utilized by staff and agencies. Agencies are required to: Inform the NGO of the intent to submit a grant; provide the application after submission; and provide a copy of the Notice of Grant Award (NOGA) or denial of funding (NRS 232.225). How agencies can meet this requirement is not clearly defined and there is currently no accountability system in place to ensure that all agencies are complying. The ‘intent to submit a grant’ needs to be clearly defined. Agencies need clear deadlines established for when they need to notify the NGO when an application has been submitted and when proof of award or denial is received by the agency. The appropriate documentation to be submitted by the agency to confirm the grant status needs to be defined so that data tracking is consistent across the state.

In order for Nevada to improve its position in federal funding received, there has to be performance measures in place to determine how current policies and infrastructure are impacting performance. Nevada needs to implement accountability standards to ensure consistent reporting from all state agencies. In many agencies, reporting of their grant attempts and performance is limited or not recorded at all. Current systems to track data are not consistent
across the state. Cohesiveness in performance review across agencies will provide clear indicators for improvement for the state. H&O consulting recommends a mandated data tracking system for all agencies within the state that are applying for federal funding. Infrastructure that supports consistent tracking and evaluation of agencies’ performance will provide clear focus areas to increase Nevada’s competitiveness in receiving federal funding.

Through H&O’s survey and interviews, staff shared frustration regarding a decrease in grant performance and management due to approvals and requirements at the division level in addition to the federal requirements. An evaluation of state grant requirements in Nevada compared to other states would be helpful in determining structural changes within the state that would minimize staff resources utilized and improve Nevada’s performance and management of received federal grants.

Cohesiveness in the use of grant writers across the state is needed to ensure that staff and resources are efficiently and effectively being utilized. Assistance from the NGO and outside partners provides agencies with the opportunity to apply for more grants. The use of these grant writers can sometimes utilize the valuable time of agency staff members to train or inform the outside grant writers so they can effectively complete the grant application for the agency. An evaluation of the effectiveness of grant writers at the agency level versus the state level (or by grant writing partners) is needed to determine the most valuable organization of staff resources.

The ideal amount of federal funding per state is debatable, but clearly Nevada’s current position in federal funding is concerning. The first step to increasing Nevada’s competitiveness is to establish policies that provide infrastructure and performance tracking capabilities. Prior to the implementation of policies to increase grant applications, the state should focus on improving strategies to manage current grant programs. Policy transitions to increase competitiveness
should minimize the potential negative impact on employee work performance as much as possible to reduce the loss of historical knowledge, staff turnover and established infrastructure within divisions to prepare and monitor grants.

Lastly, the lack of data there was in comparing the amount of federal funding received by each state not including Medicaid and formula grants was a limitation that should be looked at further to really understand the impact this has. Without knowing the performance of each state, this evaluation was not able to determine what capacity strategies are most effective.

5. Conclusion

This report examines the lack of Nevada’s federal competitiveness issues and provides background on obstacles impeding Nevada from receiving federal funding and discusses why it is critical for Nevada to improve its infrastructural systems across state, county and municipal agencies to enhance competencies that will increase capacity alongside our partnering agency Strategic Progress. With the proposed methodology and approaches, this report finds empirical evidence on why state of Nevada is lagging and potential policy implication to improve its competitiveness and capacity for federal grant.

This research project has three major limitations. The first was the scope and focus of the evaluation to include its objectives and design. The research group had a very small piece to a much larger and broader issue in finding ways the state of Nevada can enhance and increase its competitiveness in securing federal funding. Issues surrounding capacity across the state, was the specific objective the research group was responsible for addressing. With such a specific objective and in light of the confidential and sensitive nature around Nevada’s lack of competitiveness in procuring federal funding across the state, there was little autonomy in carrying out much of the research groups intended approaches.
The second limitation was the timelines not coinciding while working alongside partners and partnering agencies. In general, the research group was faced with the uncontrollable circumstance of working through the summer months which often has pertinent representatives taking leave/vacation or other pressing work commitments, thus making their availability problematic. The contacts that were necessary for some of the intended approaches also proved difficult as some were simply unresponsive at times, making it difficult to collect data. In addition to this, as previously mentioned above, the limited autonomy coupled with the constant coordination during the course of the research with the partnering agency, proved time consuming and at times unnecessary, given the restrictive confines and time the group had to adhere to. Lastly, the group on occasions were left with no clear direction and often provided delayed information, resulting in lost time and postponed work.
Appendix A:

Responses to Q10 and Q11 – Would you like to see your agency/partner apply for more grants? Why or why not?

| No | We are short of staff to manage the funds we do receive. |
| No | Not applicable |
| No | Surviving on grant funds and managing them can be all consuming. I am not a grants manager and it takes away from programmatic goals. |
| No | SAPTA applies for funding that is appropriate and targeted to our mission, thus our 100% success rate. For that reason, it would not make sense to apply for funding just to apply. |
| No | I would say yes because we all want more federal funding but applying and being awarded are entirely separate. I believe that part of the problem is that we apply for too many grants, especially ones for which we're not too competitive or the likelihood is simply too low based on the number of anticipated awardees. This has the effect of stretching our limited resources thin ultimately to no end, and it impact the quality of our applications. The typical pattern is that an award is announced, and we apply, but it would be greatly beneficially to review applications versus awards to assess strengths and weakness and to develop a strategy about the subjects in which we have more capability, thus competitiveness, to more selectively apply for those grants and to anticipate upcoming calls-for-application. |
| No | Grants are a challenge inside of our programs. Mostly because they come with two sets of rules, those provided by the Notice of Grant Award (NOGA) and those imposed on you by the State. Often these requirements to do not line up. It makes managing the grant a challenge, often for small amounts of money. For example, most of the grant years so not line up with the State fiscal year, which makes for some fun accounting hassles. In another we were given permission to purchase computers, but had to justify our purchase of those computers with the State due to what has been legislatively approved years before we even received the grant. Honestly, I spend most of my time writing reports that I am not sure the Federal Government reads. Grants come with a long list of requirements, that are often given to you in pieces, what I mean by that is, if you can meet the requirement of the grant, they often come back and say that they want you do just a little bit more. This "little bit more" often does not mesh with our programs. If they just gave you all the facts up front instead of stringing you along we would know well in advance if we wanted to participate in the award in the first place. |
| No | We apply for all grants that are applicable. Since we do not provide direct services we can only apply for grants if we have a community partner. Community partners lack of infrastructure is the problem. |
No | Yes and No. If the grant is able to provide enough funds to increase staff, then it's a worthwhile grant. However, if the grant provides minimally funding (not enough to increase staff to run the program) and there is extensive outcomes to meet, it's not worth applying for the funds. It's not just about writing more grants or chasing funding; it's about being able to effectively meet an unmet need in the community, having the staff and expertise to do that, and making sure the grant can meet those requirements to make it beneficial.

No | In a rural/frontier area, the same agencies and supporters are constantly called upon to assist with multiple grants. It gets cloudy as to boundaries and limitations.

Yes | We need more support, especially to retain clinicians once they are trained, such as myself.

Yes | Offset general fund dollars

Yes | More funding equals increased opportunity to serve the public

Yes | blah

Yes | Resources have been reduced over time and there is a greater need in the community. Additional resources need to be secured to continue this work.

Yes | Our program could use more grants.

Yes | n/a /

Yes | Grants that align with current grants help to build sustainable infrastructure.

Yes | We need to apply for and receive as much federal dollars as possible to continue to increase development of our state communities infrastructure and capacity to provide services to subpopulations and/or populations with special concerns/issues who may not receive services without federal dollars.

Yes | Additional funding to expand services would be beneficial.

Yes | Bureau of Justice Assistance offers federal funding

Yes | Grants keep the team employed

Yes | I think we have an opportunity to conduct rural based psychological research; which we would need funding to implement.

Yes | Yes, but capacity is limited. Need more staff.

Yes | The only source of funding for one program is one federal grant from HRSA and one from CDC. Available funding from these sources may diminish in the future and there is no state funding provided at this time. Continuation of program services may be negatively impacted if current grants are reduced or eliminated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>more money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The more grants applied for and received means more funds available for community programs that could improve the lives and futures of children and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In order to provide more services to the low income families in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The current funding is not sufficient to run the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>If we could find grants that would augment our current work would be good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>to increase our ability to provide services to our clients and to supplement our existing funding for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>My office is mainly grant-funded, yet Nevada receives some of the least amount of grant funding in the nation in proportion to our population number. We should get more money to be competitive nationally, increase quality of services and staff, and not present nationally as a state that can't write/keep grants as shown by the amount of money we are awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All projects for the NPBHD require funding and the more grants we can secure, the more programs we can offer and the longer we can run current programs. No money, no mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, in order to secure available funding available to improve the health of Nevadans. However, at least in our section, we have added several programs in the last four years with the ACA and discretion should be used in bringing on new initiatives. We need to ensure we have the infrastructure to support the development and initial stages while work programs and new positions are being approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1. In order to provide supplemental non-restrictive funds to workforce development system. / / 2. Provide programs for community with less restrictive requirements than WIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To fund for programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fund a poison control center, injury prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To better sustain programs necessary to help individuals in need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Yes | We are a Federally funded quasi-governmental agency that relies almost solely on DOL funds that are highly restrictive. The goal is to apply for a receive funds from a more diverse number of funding sources and be able to receive funds that are less
Yes | I recent study has shown that there are many grants available to support veteran and veteran employment. Nevada Veterans have need for these programs.
---|---
Yes | Creates more job opportunities.
---|---
Yes | Grants expands our capacity to provide more services and improve those we currently provide through technical assistance.
---|---
Yes | More applications to grants would provide more funds to execute our line of business.
---|---
Yes | There are many foundations and private giving circles that we would like to connect with.
---|---
Yes | Our biggest obstacle is not having the infrastructure, staff, resources or expertise in doing so.
---|---
Yes | Many of us are trained and/or effective grant writers. This is a developed skill that many of us do not have, or can not take the time to learn to be effective. It would be great to partner with agencies or individuals who have that skill. The other problem is cost. To hire a grant writer is expensive.
---|---
Yes | We can always use more funding for projects and programs.
---|---
Yes | County funding has been decreasing in recent years, less "hard money" is being made available for programming.
---|---
Yes | Can better leverage funds to serve more people.
---|---
Yes | To receive more funding for sustainability.
---|---
Yes | Frees us to enhance existing programs and create new ones to address service gaps and emerging needs. State budget is very tight and can be limited in scope of funded services.
---|---
Yes | Yes, I would like to see more applications completed provided they move the college forward but I do not advocate chasing the money and applying for grants just because they are available.
---|---
Yes | It would be nice to if the grant writing fee wasn't to high- Applications with strong collaboration seem to rate higher than those that do not include collaboration.
---|---
Yes | diversify funding base.
---|---
Yes | Builds capacity; may increase chance of success.
---|---
Yes | to close the gap on missed opportunities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Need actual grant writers available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>As a financially strapped, small rural county, we need all the money we can get for much needed projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Our state needs the money to implement activities and employ people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We don't have adequate funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We need more security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>It's a funding source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Most grants require collaboration so it seems natural to partner more to improve the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We can always use additional funding to increase capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Most of the grants we receive cover the cost of the program itself but not the administration or marketing to administer the program. More grants will allow us to serve a larger portion of the community and certain grants will cover the cost of overhead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, more funding is available than is currently being requested by my agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sure, but since I am the one applying for the funding, there are only so many that a non-profit is eligible to apply for in the scope of services rendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Manpower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>sustainability &amp; growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>However, the resources needed to submit a grant applications are not easily accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To off set budget cuts and keep service levels high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In order to better serve the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lack of government funds available to carry out safety net services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To fill need gaps in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>budget is very limited for our agency and we have suffered recent layoffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Grants are essentially free money awarded for well thought out and/or executed plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Many opportunities are not utilized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>There is funding our school district is missing out on but we don't have enough staff to write them or we need to partner with the State of Nevada and often the state agencies are not in a position to apply for the grants, or they want us to write them and they will file the grant (this has happened with NV Dept of Ed, NV Dept of Health and Human Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>We wish to take advantage of all possible opportunities that would positively impact our work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>the funds are limited and collaboration as a state, local would allow Nevada to obtain more funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B

**Responses to Q19: What more could be done to help secure more grants?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowing what grants are out there</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase grant writers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State does not seem to put a priority on securing grant funds. At the Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency, we are very successful because we have two very competent writers and a competent budget person, all of whom work together to secure funds. But our small group is definitely an anomaly. The state could consider having a grant writing unit but the problem with that approach is always competing deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See previous comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times the state doesn't have the staff time or expertise to write effective grants or manage those grants. There have been several times where the state applies for funding, but they are unprepared, or unaware of the local barriers, and the implementation of the grant is impossible or very difficult, so the funds go unspent. There is a communication breakdown between the state and local communities in effectively applying for and implementing grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The state's approach has been to 'push down' extra costs to county government rather than seeking unique or new funds via grants. Ideally that would have the state entities looking 'above' them for funds rather than 'pushing' them down to counties that cannot refuse the executive order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have experts, such as yourselves, complete more grants on our behalf!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more staff dedicated to grants versus it being an additional duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate reflection of front line employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater outreach of notices of available funding or more training on how to find additional resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time grants person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire people who are comfortable with writing grants and enjoy it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve research-based clinicians in the decision making processes; allowing them to be part of brain-storming, research, implementation &amp; design of research based programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More staff dedicated to grant writing.

Hiring grant writers whose sole job is to work with us to find and secure grants.

More factual research on what services are needed in Southern Nevada for low income families.

The state of Nevada is notorious for leaving money on the table. In other words they do not apply for all grants available. I do not know if this is a lack of interest, staff support, or management.

Train staff to write grants properly. Set up a system of review internally before grants are submitted to ensure we are submitting high quality and competitive grants. Increase salary of those who are writing grants to attract high-quality, experienced grant writers. Make grants a collaborative, team endeavor, ensuring multiple reviewers and less pressure on less-experienced individuals who are required to complete extensive grants individually under time-constraints (which leads to errors and lower quality work).

We need a team searching for grant funding that we could qualify for and let the appropriate programs and individuals know about them in time to apply for them.

Simplified fiscal process to expedite new budgets would make securing new funding more attractive.

1. Create systemic collaboratives that can take a proactive approach to applying. / / 2. Determine which type of grants these collaboratives would like to pursue.

More collaboration with others in the state.

Change the mindset that it isn't worth applying if there is only 1 or a few awards on a grant as NV is assumed not to be competitive.

First, agencies need to work together instead of competing against one another. Second, a government entity with authority needs to coordinate which agencies are most appropriate to apply for specific grants (a process can be established where agencies must notify the state grants administration unit if they plan to apply for federal grants so that agencies can coordinate efforts, or it can be publicly listed on a website) . Three, Nevada needs personnel dedicated specifically to helping vital agencies (especially those the government relies on to deliver services) apply and secure grant funding. Four, the Nevada State Government needs to oversee and screen who is starting a nonprofit, for what purpose (to avoid duplication and agencies competing), and if the nonprofits are effective. Too many nonprofits are wasting tax payer dollars because they are ineffective, inefficient, and there is a lack of control over this.

A more collaboration among system partners would be very helpful. Organizations seem to gravitate toward a solo approach to grant writing and I believe this shows up in the "spirit" of the submission.

A dedicated grants manager. In the past 3 years, our agency has brought in almost $10M in grants that were written and submitted by the agency director and deputy director. There are
many grants we do not apply for and could benefit from if we had the staff to manage the grant program.

Have a grants research and writing unit; have staffed trained specifically in grants management (both program and fiscal staff)

Local and state governments need more resources. Also, more collaboration and support from the local community partners and governments would help secure more grants.

Unification of certain documents, a common grants application that could be used for all grants within our state, more technical assistance on how to submit.

Making Nevada or the region look more competitive. Showing more infrastructure to handle larger grants and delivering when we actually are awarded monies.

I don't know.

state partnerships within state divisions / state partnerships with nonprofit more entities / state partnerships with more community organizations / hire position specifically to look for grants and assist in grant writing process (specifically in the southern area (e.g., Clark county)) /

Manage the ones we have efficiently and have some people in each agency to seek funds, and follow thru on them

More time dedicated to applying for them

Develop grants committees...individuals from financial, clinical, program, etc areas who have familiarity with grant development and grant writing and who are given work time to meet and complete apps as RFPs appear. / / Ability to gain state approval for local grant efforts--rather than statewide. / / Ability to gain approval for smaller grants for worthy, limited projects--under $500,000.

1) Better communication about where needs are and what resources are already available throughout the state. / 2) Better ways to discover and access potential partners before grants are even considered. Organizations within the state tend to operate in a silo structure and scramble at the last minute to find appropriate partners for grant applications when partnerships should already be in place. / 3) Ongoing discussion about needs and solutions so that organizations are proactively seeking grant opportunities that fit those needs/solutions instead of "chasing the money," which is dreaming up a project to respond to grant opportunities that are announced. /

More time, more grant writers, more research

increased communication and collaboration between entities

Apply!
No one is at fault, it takes time, partnerships, collaboration, competence and it is added on to regular duties.

Hire grant writers. Have fewer people sending out announcements of grants—that is annoying.

Although many of us have grant writing as part of our experience, we are bogged down with so many other responsibilities that we have a hard time dedicating all that time to writing a specific grant. It would be great to have a grant lead for all the sections whose sole purpose is to write grants or make the state's grant procurement section bigger and more accessible to all programs.

Add dedicated positions to do this type of work versus imposing additional duties on staff with current workload demands who don't have enough time to give 100% of such tasks.

Streamline the fiscal process; more support for program staff in grants management.

Have non profit agencies collaborate on grants.

Need more commitment to match funds and set up systems to make us competitive as a state.

My answer for the other questions would be I don't know. I don't know the answer to this questions either. We apply for the grants that are available through state agency's

Collaboration but the state only works with state nonprofits like NAHAC, Home means Nevada or Financial Guidance Center. We recently wrote a white paper on a down payment assistance (DPA) program and submitted it to the AG to be funded with the AG Settlement Funds. Disappointed when we learned the state was going to roll out a new DPA program to be administered by the agencies listed above.

Many of the State and Federal pass through money is awarded based on the agency funding history. The same agencies get the same funding over and over, based on who they know. Should these agencies provide for a fair and balanced competition, agencies may be able to secure additional funding.

Work closer with counties and collaborate on finding and writing grants, even if only the state level can apply.

For the larger federal grants, quality technical assistance would need to be a part of the delivery from the state.

The primary issue with applying for grant funding in Nevada is the lack of readily available data.

If we had a grant clearinghouse or peer review system to help learn from each other. Take advantage of those who are more seasoned/experienced and learn the best approach to applying for grants.
More staff would probably be needed but the State, like the County does not have the resources available to hire more personnel.

- Provide additional resources to write grants
- Offer free grant writing courses
- Better collection of data, access to grants analysts
- Stronger applications, more time to get internal grant approval prior to sending out application. More resources for state and local government and NGOs to utilize.

The organizations in Nevada need to understand that it takes more "boots on the ground" to write more proposals. I work as a one-person grant writing/grant management department. This organization should have a team of 5-6 people.

I think there needs to be more thought at the state level of what grants to apply for. Also the state needs to have a data base of what grants state and local agencies have procedures in order to leverage those grants with new applications. State needs to establish a network for understanding what grants are out there. Currently, there are emails that come from the state grant office of new grant competitions, but it needs to go beyond that. The state needs to be more strategic in what grants they want to apply for and then really solicit state departments and other agencies to help put those applications together. Also, many of the state offices do not have the staffs that have the understanding of how to write grants and then manage the grants. The state needs to train their employees more in this area and rely on resources such as the Nevada Grant Professional Association to help with the training and be a resource.

- More matching funds available
- Have a mechanism to inform who is writing for the grants.
Appendix C

Responses to Q12: Please rate the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>When applying, I feel confident I will receive a grant.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My agency/partner gives me appropriate time to apply for grants.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My agency/partner mobilizes quickly to be competitive in procuring grants.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My agency/partner give me appropriate resources to apply for grants (i.e. grant writers, matching funds, training, etc).</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel my agency/partner has the appropriate resources to apply for grants (i.e. grant writers, matching funds, training, etc).</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. I feel my agency/partner values the importance of grants. | 5 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 31 | 24 | 81 |
7. I am optimistic about the future of my agency/partner receiving grants. | 5 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 25 | 12 | 81 |
8. I feel my agency/partner is prepared to respond to RFPs when announced. | 10 | 7 | 14 | 27 | 17 | 8 | 81 |
Appendix D

Responses to Q24: Rank the following items in order using 1 to 7 by dragging the choices; 1 being the BIGGEST roadblock to securing grants, 7 being the SMALLEST roadblock.

Organizational/Government structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of employee interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lack of appropriate grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insufficient staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing | 47 | 58.0 |
Total | 81 | 100.0 |
### Lack of experience/knowledge (i.e. training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missing match funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing 47 58.0
Total 81 100.0
Lack of collaborative partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E

#### Responses to Q23: Please add any additional roadblocks in securing grants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of the higher ups in the Public and Behavioral Health organization.</td>
<td>We get no thanks at all just give us the $$$$$$$!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didn't know we could do this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge. I wish there was a handbook created for the division, outlining tips, processes and resources that can be given to grant-writers.</td>
<td>This could fill a lot of holes regarding what's available, as well as increase efficiency. I had to take a grant-writing course to learn a lot about do's and don'ts, but there should be something more in-house to use to aid the grant-writing process. Maybe a working-group or monthly webinars for the division with guest speakers giving tips, resources, and advice to aid in successful grant writing and procurement. Then those could be housed on our shared drives, accessible by topic for anyone in the process with questions or needs ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability ask for assistance from &quot;experts&quot; within the Division.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of awareness and skills in the application process to secure grants for IZ programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of emphasis on developing the grant based funding resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of fiscal support; fiscal office is not helpful and acts as a roadblock rather than a partner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff and time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff to focus on grants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of staff, lack of concentrated blocks of time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of sufficient notice to prepare it once you find it. It always seems like a scramble to meet a deadline once you get approval to apply for it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to complete grant apps while completing other duties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time. As program managers we are extremely busy and not very many people know how to write grants. Therefore the program managers end up having to write them, with very limited time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited grant monies available many times with each reward. If the federal partner only awards four awards than Nevada isn't usually competitive due to many of the reasons listed above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need additional filtering of FOAs before sharing internally and with external partners. For example, numerous FOAs for long standing state programs that are only available to state entities are shared with external partners, artificially piquing their interest and potentially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wasting their valuable time in pursuit.
No staff in local outlets either dedicated to grant development and writing or with time released from other duties to respond to RFP’s

Non-applicable

None

None. Since our section is all federally funded, we are fairly skilled to apply for new opportunities.

Our Administrator encourages the pursuit of grants, however, we do not have designated staff and have missed many grant opportunities due to multiple conflicting priorities for day-to-day operations.

Poor Writing.

Request for overtime is often dismissed and not enough time is allotted to write.

Shortness of staff, resources and infrastructure with all of the other immense (unrelated to grants) job requirements, duties and expectations

The main roadblock to securing grants is the lack of grant availability in many programmatic areas. Some programs have a variety of grants that can be applied for while other programs rarely, if ever, see grant opportunities that apply to the program.

Those on top cover it well. Lots of added work to current workloads.

time - capacity

Training

Unknown
Appendix F

Responses to Q26: Rank the following items in order using 1 to 7 by dragging the choices; 1 being the BIGGEST roadblock to securing grants, 7 being the SMALLEST roadblock.

Organizational/Government structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of employee interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lack of appropriate grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missing System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Insufficient staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missing System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lack of experience/knowledge (i.e. training)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Missing match funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of collaborative partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 81 100.0
### Appendix G

**Responses to Q27: Please add any additional roadblocks in securing grants.**

| Lack of knowledge and available staff to do research and formulate competitive proposals. |
| Missing opportunities (only finding out about them with little time to write the grant) / |
| None |
| na |
| N/A |

**Requirements for them to become self-supporting**

| It sometimes appears that there is a bias against Nevada when it comes to receiving Federal grants. Also, many of the SGAs that are released are not a good fit for Nevada. We are a unique state with many disparate issues that other states do not share. |
| Time |
| N/A |
| time is the biggest road block- decreasing federal funds, more requirements with less time to complete them. |
| Finding reliable data and securing regional data is very difficult in Nevada. The most prevalent data for the State seems to come from federal sources. Nevada governmental agencies often cannot or will not provide specifically requested data. |
| Most often, it's related to finding the grant that is relevant to meet the need. Oftentimes, grants are very specific to what they want you to do with the funds, and they may or may not be relevant to your community. |
| The time it takes to complete a grant application. Some of them are very time consuming. |
| State bureaucracy deters a culture of competitiveness. Delays in approval to implement grants. Reduction of general fund when a grant is brought in also deters. |
| There is no ambition from the manager to take on additional grants. |
| There appears to be a lack of understanding of social service grants in my organization and a reluctance to applying for grants because of the perceived need to continue the program after grant funding has expired. There have been several grants that have come up that I have not been given approval to apply for. This has resulted in a loss of enthusiasm to apply for extra grants. |
| None |
| unknown / |
| none |
| No further comments |
| Support staff is needed for boilerplate and standard tasks such as assembling appendices. |
| NONE |
| County does not have grant writer position so each entity is required to secure grant funding. This creates problem because few staff members are properly trained in grant writing and grant administration. |
| lack of time | Knowing the different agencies and the type of funding. |
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Federal Government Expenditure, Per Capita Amounts by State, by Major Agency: Fiscal Year 2008
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Federal Government Expenditure, Per Capita Amounts by State, by Major Agency: Fiscal Year 2009

(U.S. Census Bureau, 2010)
Federal Government Expenditure, Per Capita Amounts by State, by Major Agency: Fiscal Year 2010

(United States Census Bureau, 2011)
Appendix K

Graph of Regional States Federal CAN Award Amount without Medicaid (Indexed)

(U.S. Department of Health and Human Services)

(United States Census Bureau, 2011)
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Graph of Turnaround States Federal CAN Award Amount without Medicaid (Indexed)

(U.S. Department of Health and Human Services)
(United States Census Bureau, 2011)
Appendix M

Focus Group 8/8 questions

- Please explain the scope of your group’s responsibilities, each person’s job title/description and your involvement in the grant writing process.
- How long have you held your current position?
- What is your department’s approach to pursuing Federal funding?
- How does the department respond to RFP’s?
- Does the department have advanced preparation and the ability to respond to RFP’s when announced?
- What are the processes (or lack thereof) to securing Federal funding?
- What percentage of time do you spend procuring grants? Do you need more or less time?
- What percentage of time do you spend managing grants? Do you need more or less time?
- How much time is spent applying for one grant? Does the time spent vary from grant to grant? Does it depend on the individual(s) who are applying?
- How many people are involved in the writing of your grants?
- Can we quantify how understaffed the department is in respect to pursuing grants (staff capacity?) How quickly can you mobilize to apply and be competitive for grants?
• In a year, how many grants do you apply for and how many do you receive? What is your goal for grant applications submitted? What is your goal for received grants?

• How confident are you that you will receive the grants that you apply for?

• How many grants do you wish to apply for, but are unable to apply for? How many do you not apply for because you don’t think you qualify or because you are unlikely to receive the funds?

• Is there any reason why receiving more grant funding would not have a positive result for your program(s)? Is there any reason you would not want to apply for more grant funding?

• What could the state do to secure more grants?

• Do you have enough time to apply for grants? Do you have enough resources to apply for grants?

• What resources currently exist in your department to support you with the grant process?

• Would the grant application process be more successful if it was entirely in house?

• How is the Grant Management Office involved with the grant process (specifically for you)? How could the Grant Management Office offer you more support?

• What is your biggest roadblock in the grant process? Please explain.
  
  o Examples:

  ▪ Organizational/Government structure
  ▪ Lack of employee interest
- Lack of appropriate grants
- Insufficient staff
- Lack of experience/knowledge (i.e. training)
- Missing match funds
- Lack of collaborative partners
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