

GRANTS REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING
January 16, 2007

Members Present: Stephen Kealoha, Lee Stein, Kent Stewart, Kenneth Rothman, Christina Paleka, Carl Shelton, Susan Bendon, Albert Nyberg, Cynthia Arruiza

Staff: Wendy Stebbins, Acting Grants Management Administrator
Ellen Pelissero, Grants Management Program Specialist
Edward Kushi, Deputy Corporation Council

MINUTES

- I. CALL TO ORDER – 8:30**
- II. PUBLIC TESTIMONY – None**
- III. ANNOUNCEMENT – Wendy introduced Ellen Pelissero, GMD’s temporary Program Specialist**
- IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - A. GRC Meetings of November 14, 2006. Approved**
- V. NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. Vote to keep site visit report in-house.**
 1. Susan stated that she wrote site visit reports with recommendations she thought may be helpful to the agencies but doesn’t want it to go back, having them make changes based on just her opinion, and suggested keeping site visit reports in-house.
 2. Susan motioned: To keep individual site visit reports in-house and not have it sent to the agencies, and Kent seconded.
 3. Discussion:
 - Albert said that he was under the impression that they were to evaluate and provide feedback to the agencies assessed.
 - Susan said that she thought so as well until the GRC’s meeting with Pamela Tumpap, where Pamela talked about responsibilities to the agencies with just one person’s opinion probably not being valid in evaluations.
 - Wendy said that it is the GMD’s role to do evaluations, conduct formal site visit periodically throughout the year, and that the GRC’s role is just to familiarize themselves with the agencies.
 - Kent asked Ed Kushi if there would be a problem regarding public record with informal familiarization type documents circulated within the GRC.
 - Ed stated that anything written that’s kept in the committee (e.g. letters, formal reports) is deemed public record, and it’s up to the GRC if they want copies sent to the agencies.
 - Lee suggested keeping it completely objective and descriptive rather than evaluative.
 - Ed stated that within the county there are ways in which the GRC can discuss extreme issues using an executive session which would be called to freely discuss the matter. Various reasons of which might be to consult the

attorney regarding confidential or criminal matters involving the subject. It could be properly discussed, minutes would be kept executive until the matter is exposed, and the matter won't be exposed until it is decided whether or not it deserves credit.

- Kenneth said he thought the agencies had a right to see what is written up in their files and if there were something that would have an extreme impact on the agency they should be able to answer to it.
 - Susan said that while her reports weren't bad it was meant to educate the GRC, but she went a little further to list the conditions under which they are forced to operate. She said if she knew it would be something for the agencies she would have written it in a more generic form.
 - Al said there should be feedback provided to the agencies in some fashion.
 - Stephen pointed out that the GRC's role is to provide CPG funding to agencies for their programs and anything pertaining to how the program is working, how they're doing with meeting their goals and so forth should really be the extent of their consideration; anything beyond that is just going beyond the GRC's role.
 - Cynthia asked what would happen if they have a negative site visit, and said if it's done in writing it is going to be public knowledge.
 - Ed said hypothetically, if she got a negative/damaging site visit report, she would consult and discuss with the chair. The chair would then talk to someone else. If it needs to be put before the whole committee, put it on the agenda and call an executive session. Staff can then internally monitor based on site visit concerns.
4. Stephen asked if there were further discussion and on the matter and since there was none called to vote on the motion which was carried unanimously.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. GMD Report and Audit Update

1. Wendy stated that she did not have much to report except that all the audits are completed. Including Kihei Youth Center who handed in a written report on their financial status. Copies of their report were distributed to the committee.

B. Subcommittee Reports/Update

1. Grant Review Process Proposal

- Stephen stated that they've been talking about the process for a couple of meetings and has gotten very good feedback, and although some of the committee members may not have attended one or two of these meetings the written recommendations stand as is. He asked to do a final feedback commentary from everyone, and to hopefully bring it to a vote at the next meeting.
- Albert said that while he expressed his position that he is for the new procedure, he has concerns about the process and asked if they should be talking to Wendy and the Department in the first instance, then getting the regulations changed—or if it is done simultaneously. He referred to the regulations state that “each party shall be allocated 15 minutes unless permitted otherwise to present their case.”

- Stephen said it shouldn't be a problem because of the way it is written and that he read it to mean a minimum and that they can permit the party's to have an hour.
- Wendy said that her main concerns were scheduling and the commitment of the committee to go to each agency, because it is very time-consuming and chaotic for the GMD.
- Stephen said that all the GMD is being asked to do is schedule all the meetings and to work in conjunction with each panel leader. He said that the GRC is not asking the GMD to go out to visit the agencies with them.
- Susan explained that the head of each panels would coordinate within their group a schedule of when they can meet, and what agencies they can see. The panel leader would then inform the GMD so they could then schedule that times with the agencies.
- Lee said that she was away for about month and wasn't clear on the change.
- Susan gave a brief summary explaining that the GRC would be split into teams of three; they would then go out on site visits instead of the agencies coming and making their presentations during the hearings. Each team would schedule two to four days and would see between three and five agencies a day. At each site visit the agency will make their presentation, the subcommittee would be able to ask questions, view the site, and the agency would wrap up with a summary.
- Lee asked what would happen if her schedule doesn't allow her to do that, and said that she may be off island two days a week for the next year.
- Susan said that they would work it around her schedule.
- Lee asked if that meant, for Molokai—if there would be an agency in each panel.
- Susan said that they've worked it out to have committee members who go to Molokai see all Molokai agencies so that there is only one panel that goes there.
- Kent said that one of his concerns with this process is the availability and role of input that each panel might want from staff, and suggested institutionalizing the role of input from staff.
- Wendy said that the GMD could provide input to them but explained that because the GMD is very short staffed and that she manages over fifty grants herself, she didn't know all agencies intimately.
- Stephen suggested building into the process to include staff during the subcommittee meetings when each panel gathers to deliberate make recommendation—at that point staff could provide input.
- Kent said that it would means staff would have to make themselves available during these deliberations and seems to be the best way of obtaining input as could be designed.
- Wendy agreed that the best time to provide input would be during the subcommittee deliberations but reminded the committee that the GMD has been short staffed for two years and cannot make any promises.
- Albert said another issue he had concerns about was overall efficiency, and while the committee perceives that the new procedure would make their time

more efficient, it's also important that the GMD's time, whether it's committed to the GRC's time also needs to be efficient. He mentioned that Wendy had articulated as she did today that it would be somewhat confusing, and maybe by the next meeting Wendy could give some thought to how much time will be saved or how much time will be...

- Wendy said that it's difficult because it's a new process and would be extremely difficult for her to say that it would take a lot more or less of the GMD's time.
 - Stephen suggested looking at it from each activity that's involved and said the application process will not change—the applications will be sent out, come back, be screened, and then forwarded to the GRC—the only real change will mainly be on the committee's part. The GMD staff will not be involved in the site visits unless they want to. The only part the staff will be responsible for is scheduling the meetings, which is done in the current process but in a different way. During the panel discussions and the final committee meeting the amount of time involved will be the equivalent or less for three full days of meetings.
 - Susan said that they estimated that approximately 18 hours would be needed to do site visits. After all site visits have been completed each panel will meet to deliberate and recommend funding allocations which would be another three to four hours. Finally the entire GRC will meet to discuss and approve the final allocations which would be another four to six hours. Not including travel time it would be a net total of approximately 28 hours is needed. There will be further savings in time in the review process because the GRC will not have to read as many grants.
 - Lee said that it seemed to her that the way it was now where agencies come in, the GRC is totally in charge of the process whereas, when the GRC goes to them the agencies are more in charge of the process.
 - Stephen said that each panel would get together and make their own recommendations for that particular panel and eventually the whole committee would get together and the panel will make a presentation on what their recommendations are and the full body will have to vote on it. If the rest of the GRC has question then they can bring it up.
 - Ed said that he really suggest that somebody from staff attend all meetings.
 - Wendy agreed but said the GMD doesn't have the staff.
 - Stephen asked Ed if he was referring to the site visits.
 - Ed affirmed and said all their meetings also. If possible.
 - Milestone spreadsheets for the GMD and GRC outlining the grant application and grant review process were distributed.
2. Grants Application/Scoring Evaluation
- Kent apologized, he wanted to have a written report of what his subcommittee discussed but was unable to do so. Some of the things recalled that was discussed or suggested was to look at the possibility of a short evaluation form for smaller grants; cutting down the applications; work on the evaluation forms for the focusing more on how the agency fulfills community

needs and more responsive to evaluating critical issues. They also needed to work on the criteria worksheet for Panels to the committee of the whole.

- Stephen said that the most critical thing was for Kent's subcommittee to tackle would be the grant application and evaluation forms and asked Kent if he would like Susan's subcommittee to handle the item regarding panel criteria worksheet. Kent said that would be fine and Susan agreed.
 - Wendy mentioned that Ellen has been working on the application and one thing staff has discussed is cutting the narrative from ten to five pages.
3. Kenneth brought up duplications in the grant budget for each year and asked if it needed to be done like that.
- Wendy said a budget is needed for each year.
 - The GRC's concern is that the same information is being repeated for each year with only the year that it refers to changing. He asked if one form could be used for each year of the grant cycle.
 - Ellen: This might be solvable in terms of what were trying to do to minimize, first of all, the size of the application and to make the language consistent. We're also trying to simplify the language so that it's common English and not written in governmental, subject to review by Ed of course. And then to make the evaluation form parallel to the application. You could extract exactly what you need in terms of budgets, changes that might have occurred, changes in the board of governors or directors of the agency, or whatever, which could be an annual addendum filed to the original application and awarded grant. So, all you would have to review perhaps would be an addendum that address very specific items in the same order... but as an addendum piece, and that could be a one or two page form.
 - Kent's subcommittee will schedule to meet regarding the grant application and evaluation form.

VII. SITE VISIT REPORTS

- With the new grant review process it was concluded that the committee members could continue doing site visits if they wanted to.

VIII. NEXT MEETING

A. March 21, 2007

- Originally scheduled for March 13, 2007 however, due to conflicts in schedules and after some discussion it was changed.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted by: NaniLei Busby, Grants Management Clerk Typist.