

**PPHF – 2012 – Elder Abuse Prevention Interventions Program**

**Technical Assistance Call Transcript**

**June 21, 2012**

**3:00 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. ET**

**Moderator: Stephanie Whittier Eliason**

---

Coordinator: Welcome and thank you for standing by. I'd just like to inform all parties that your lines have been placed in a listen-only mode until the question and answer session of today's conference.

Today's conference is also being recorded. If you have any objections - I - you may disconnect at this time.

I would now like to turn the meeting over to Ms. Stephanie Whittier Eliason. Ma'am you may begin.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Hi. Thank you (Calvin). Thank you everyone for joining the call today. We're on the call to talk about the new Funding Opportunity Announcement that was released last week, the Elder Abuse Prevention Intervention Program.

Today our format for the call will be probably the first 15 minutes we'll walk through some key points that we'd like to share with everyone and hopefully get to some issues or questions that people have sort of preemptively.

And then we're going to open it up to a moderated question and answer time. And at that point (Calvin) will provide instructions on how to get into the queue to ask your question.

The call is being recorded today. We'll have transcripts available so you can refer back to them. Once we get the transcript we'll post it online.

We're also going to prepare a document of frequently asked questions. It'll be a much shorter document than the transcript where people can see some of the more frequently, obviously more frequently, asked questions and refer to it that way.

So today you'll be hearing from myself, Stephanie Whittier Eliason. I'm the identified project officer in the program announcement for Option 1.

On the line as well is (Nicholas Fox) who will also be a project officer for some of the grants for Option 1.

Meg Graves will be talking about Option 2. And we will be joined by Edwin Walker and Barbara Dieker to give us an overview of the program announcement and the larger vision that we have, as well as Heather Wiley from our Office of Grants Management who will be able to address questions related to budget or anything specific about the grants role.

So at this point I'll go ahead and turn it over to Barbara who can set the context for us.

Barbara Dieker: Thank you so much Stephanie. And I am Barbara Dieker. I'm the Director of the Office of Elder Rights here at AOA and the ACL as many of you now know it.

And I am thrilled to be here today to talk about these grants that we're so excited about. Edwin Walker will be joining us a little bit later. He's a little bit delayed but he will be joining us.

And I want to thank all of you that are on the line, the great turnout we have for this call today and your interest in this program announcement.

I also hope that many of you were either participants in your local communities or in person or somehow participated last Thursday in our 7th Annual World Elder Abuse Awareness Day but our first ever one that we actually got to celebrate at the White House.

It was a wonderful event. It was thrilling. There were a number of great announcements that were made that I think all of which will further the whole endeavor of Elder Abuse Prevention.

And the one that we are particularly excited to focus in on today is the announcement made by Secretary Kathleen Sibelius about a \$5.5 million funding opportunity for states and tribes to test ways to prevent elder abuse, neglect and exploitation.

And of course this initiative is going to help us to in the implementation of the Elder Justice Act which as you know was enacted as part of the Affordable Care Act.

So the Secretary made this announcement last Thursday. And actually part of her message for those of you that did not hear the secretary speak I would like to just quote for you because I think it's where we are today.

And she said “today we are sending a clear message that elder abuse will not be tolerated or kept in the shadows.”

So this funding opportunity then is, we feel, an excellent chance to move the field of elder abuse prevention forward.

And the only other thing I would like to say in way of introduction because Stephanie and Meg are going to get more specific into the details of options one and options two is that we are really looking for some good quality applications that really seek to increase the evidence base for programs and interventions that are seeking to prevent elder abuse neglect and exploitation and their negative effect on the health and well-being of seniors.

And we know that elder abuse is a substantial public health problem. And that is the focus of our grants and of our efforts.

So with that introduction I'm going to turn it over to Stephanie to talk about Option 1.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Great thank you Barbara. So in walking through Option 1, and I think it will be the same for Meg in Option 2, we're really just going to focus on special items that we would like to emphasize or some of the questions that we've gotten already.

When we turn to Q&A please feel free to ask more in-depth questions related to either Option 1 or Option 2.

The first thing that I do want to note is that we have approximately \$5,050,000 that will be made available for five to eight cooperative agreements.

The funding range is an estimate for each grant. We have it in the funding announcement as at least 625,000 to about 1 million.

Again it's a range for each grant depending on how many we fund. And that will be determined based on the quality of applications and the reviews, how each one is scored and where we might have a natural cut off, as well as the funding that is requested per application and what we have available.

The goals of Option 1, and this applies to Option 2, are to draw on existing research and promising practices to pilot and test interventions so that we can determine how useful they are in actually preventing elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.

As many of you know in the field of elder abuse we don't have a lot of research right now on what is effective prevention. We have a lot of things that are promising. We have a lot of models from other family violence areas but they haven't really been tested adequately in the area of elder abuse. And this is the goal of this program announcement and funding opportunity: to try to begin to establish an evidence base around those. So therefore we want to further our understanding of elder abuse and how to prevent it.

But we also have another goal, we hope this funding opportunity will facilitate improvements in existing data collection systems. And the way that we envision that is, as you will see to this funding announcement, there is a requirement for Option 1 applicants to partner with the state adult protective services agency if that agency is not the applicant themselves.

The goal for that is to begin utilizing APS administrative data to help drill down to the local level to see what we can find out about risk and protective factors, as well as any other information that could be gleaned from the

administrative data that can help give us an understanding of the phenomenon of elder abuse neglect and exploitation. And by using these data in the pilot, we hope to be able to determine what would be some other very critical data collection elements for a state APS data system or others. Our hope is that we might be then be able to turn that out in terms of maybe some promising practices, best practices recommendations, suggestions on improving data systems.

So moving on to the proposed prevention activities, Attachment G is a section of the program announcement that we're going to continually refer people to. There's a description of what we are beginning to understand about risk factors, about prevention, as well as a Logic model which is cited as a requirement in the FOA as well.

One thing to note that on Page 57 of Attachment G it speaks very clearly that this funding announcement will only fund selective preventive intervention or indicated preventive interventions. So I refer people back to the attachment. It's again on Page 54. Excuse me, I cited it incorrectly. It's Page 54 for a description of what a selective or indicated preventive intervention is, as well as the source of those definitions. And you can also refer to those sources for more discussion on what that is.

In the program announcement there is also a section on effective or required partnerships. Please be sure to review those required partnerships. It's on Pages 8 to 9. And these our prior partners if that entity is not the applicant themselves. The partners are a state APS office, a state unit on aging, a justice system component.

And then we'll have letters of commitment. These are not letters of support. These are actually going to be strong letters of collaboration and commitment

from your identified partners. It needs to be very clear in the roles and responsibilities that each partner will have in the effort. Any partners that are identified outside of the state APS office, the state unit on aging or the justice system must also be accompanied by a letter of collaboration or partnership.

We also have a data and evaluation component. We draw your attention to this. It's on Pages 9 through 10. You'll also see some information on data and evaluation in the cooperative agreement. Option one will have a separate evaluation component. These applications do not need to include an evaluation section. Now you will need to include some proposed performance measures as is discussed in the FOA. But you don't need to include a large amount of money, or a robust effort around and an evaluation. We are engaging a national evaluator who will work with the grantees individually, as well as collectively, on outcome measures and other data elements for both the individual project receiving grant funding as well as the overall initiative.

And just to be very clear, in applying for these funds and potentially in receiving them you agree to work with the national evaluator and you are agreeing to the conditions that are set forth in the cooperative agreement about what would be expected from you in terms of that cooperation.

And lastly I want to get to eligibility which has been a very big question I've gotten a ton of inquiries about that. For Option 1 the eligible applicants are identified as quote, state government entities. There's been a lot of questions about what constitutes a state government entity. For the purposes of this program announcement, a state government entity is part of the executive branch of a state's government.

If it is not clear whether you are a part of the executive branch or if you're considered a state government entity you will need to supply a letter from the

governor or from an executive branch entity that recognizes or designates your organization as a state government entity which would then make you eligible to apply.

A state funded university is not automatically considered a state government entity even if you have a letter from your state comptroller or the IRS that identifies you as being considered as a state agency in terms of taxes.

For purposes of this program announcement, the way it's been established is that you have to be officially a state government entity either of the executive branch, or recognized by your governor or an executive branch agency as being a state government entity and therefore eligible to apply.

That might be confusing so when we get to the Q&A Heather and I and Edwin and others can hopefully provide some more clarification if you have anything specific.

Heather does that letter need to be provided with the application or at least before the award?

Heather Wiley: It should be provided with the application because you want to have that application ready for reviewers. If there is no support from the executive branch of the state for this particular application then it probably will not be reviewed.

If you have started a letter and could not get that letter in time you can always add the letter stating in your application that we have requested this letter of support if you want to continue with application and you just have not received the letter back signed in time to submit your application by July 31<sup>st</sup> (the due date).



Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay great. Thank you.

Heather Wiley: Thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes. And then also we had some questions from various entities. So the administrative Office of the Courts is generally considered part of the executive branch.

The state attorney's general office is generally considered part of the executive branch. State law enforcement or public safety agencies are also typically considered part of the executive branch.

If we are unclear of your status, we will be able to follow-up with applicants individually. But if you are concerned that there might be questions it's always excellent to be a little bit more proactive and provide whatever documentation you feel would justify your status, your application as a state government entity so that, for instance, you aren't rushing around in 24 hours trying to get that information pulled together.

So that's all I have as important things to highlight for Option 1. I'm going to turn it over to Meg Graves now to highlight a few things for Option 2.

Meg Graves: Good afternoon. Option 2 addresses the Native American elder abuse prevention grants. And there's approximately \$500,000 available for two to three cooperative agreements with estimated funding per applicant of \$150,000 to \$250,000.

Eligible applicants are federally recognized tribes, and tribal organizations representing federally recognized tribes.

I want to point out just a few areas in the announcement. On Page 11, under the overview section of the announcement, we referred to projects that were funded in the past that explore the needs of Indian elders related to the problems of elder abuse, neglect and exploitation. One was by the National Center on Elder Abuse and the other by our office, American Indian and Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian programs. Both reports can be found on a Web site which is listed within the program announcement so you can read the full reports because the activities under this funding opportunity are to address at least one of the needs identified in one or both of the reports.

Examples that were given on Page 11, as are all the recommendations that were in the report, are just some examples of what was in there. And we also gave examples of ideas to consider for projects. However don't limit yourself to these. These are just examples. And you can certainly come up with your own project ideas based on the recommendations from these two reports.

Partnering: Stephanie spoke a little bit about this. Applicants are required to partner with a tribal college, academic institution or other organization that has the capacity to provide guidance and consultation during the implementation of the of the proposed elder abuse prevention intervention. However if you feel you have the in-house capacity to meet this requirement you must demonstrate that within the narrative of your proposal. Otherwise you must include signed letters of commitment from each of the partners as stated under the responsiveness and screening criteria on Page 20.

Applications will be scored on how well they demonstrate they have the required capacity to carry out the proposal whether it's within your own organization or with your partner's.

And lastly performance measures, as Stephanie had pointed out you are not required to work with the evaluator and you're not required to provide an evaluation. However you will need to discuss the performance outcome measures for your proposed projects. And this will be part of the review and scoring of all of our applications. So pay particular attention as well to the review criteria that are outside reviewers readdressing when reviewing these applications. Thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Great thanks Meg. This is Stephanie again. And actually, Meg highlighted something that we wanted to draw all the applicant's attention to.

Throughout the development of your proposal and your application, we encourage you to refer continually to three sections of the Funding Opportunity Announcement. Those sections are: the narrative descriptions found on Pages 23 to 26; we encourage you to also review very carefully the review criteria, to understand how you will be scored, on Page 27 and 29 (You want to make sure that in your discussion you are always covering what the reviewers are going to be looking for), and we refer you repeatedly to Attachment G throughout at least the first section under Option 1 of the FOA, on Pages 54 to 57.

The reviewers will also be looking at applications through the context of what has been provided through attachment G.

A few other points, again Meg had talked about examples that have been used in Option 2. But, throughout the FOA there are examples that have been provided. We want to highlight and stress that these are just examples. They've been provided for illustrative purposes to help readers understand the intent and the purpose of the FOA. The list is not exhaustive nor is it limiting. Please don't feel constrained to limit your application only to the examples

that have been provided. Again, they're for illustrative purposes. Please remember that you will always need to provide a strong rationale and justification for choosing any particular intervention or target group.

And we've identified examples of target groups. You don't have to stay with those targets but you do have to identify a target group and provide a justification for it.

And then finally, on Page 8 there's a requirement for a logic model for Option 1, and for Option 2 -for the tribal application- it's on Page 12. So Page 8 for Option 1 Page 12 for Option 2 there is a requirement for a logic model. We noticed there was an oversight that in the discussion of the project narrative there wasn't a specific section that identified where you would insert discussion of your logic model.

The one page diagram that would represent your logic model can be submitted as an attachment and not counted towards the 30 page page limit, which I'll just go ahead and address. Heather will get to it in more detail.

It is a 30-page page limit for the applications for action - Option 1 or Option 2. We thought we caught all of the references to page number and we didn't and we apologize but the page limit is 30 pages. Heather will talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

So, your logic model diagram can be an attachment. However, the project narrative should discuss the logic model that's required in the program announcement. That discussion is going to be counted as part of that 30 page limit. It will be part of your project narrative. It's just that one page diagram that will be considered an attachment. And it should be a diagram. It will be referred to as a diagram. It should not constitute any substantive or

meaningful discussion about your project. Reviewers will be looking at the diagram for a visual representation of what you propose. They will not be looking at your diagram for substantive content that should have been included in your narrative.

Again, the diagram will be included as an attachment. It may not be considered as part of the substantive review. So be sure to discuss your logic model very clearly and thoroughly in the project narrative.

And I believe that is it for me so I'm going to turn this now back over to Heather who will discuss some of the grant comments

Heather Wiley: My name is Heather Wiley. I'm with the Office of Grants Management. And I just wanted to remind everyone that the project narrative section of the application does have a page limit of 30 pages which we said previously.

And the application will be reviewed for adherence to that screening criteria. It's on Page 19 for Option 1 and Page 20 for Option 2. So please be sure the narrative that you submit with the application has the correct margins, is double spaced and has a minimum size 11 font. And that includes any text that you include in bulleted lists, text boxes, or any other information that you're going to choose to put into that narrative portion of the application.

Please make sure to double space. All applications will be expanded to double space at a minimum size font of 11 with margins of 1 inch. And if the narrative is longer than 30 pages we will have to cut that off. And those pages will not be included for the reviewers. So that 30 pages is the limit.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: So this is Stephanie again. We would actually recommend that you probably therefore would not want to use text boxes or any kind of special

formatting or anything to make your application look “pretty”. It should just be a straight-forward narrative in a very logical order that people can follow very readily. If you do use items in a list, which many of us like to do as it helps with the reading, flow, and structure, that's fine. But your list needs to also be double spaced.

So lists are not exempt from the double spacing requirement. And everything should be in a font not smaller than 11 font.

Heather Wiley: Good. I think we covered that. We're also willing to take some questions after the session about that.

In terms of the budget portion of the application, I ask you to please refer to your fiscal staff with any questions regarding your application budget. Now your fiscal staff has information of the policies directly related to your organization within your state. They're the ones that are going to be the best people to answer any questions about the budget.

The Department of Health and Human Services also has a great Web site that will answer a lot of your questions while you're preparing your application. That Web site is <http://www.hhs.gov/grants>. And you'll find quite a bit of information on that Web site to assist you.

This award is going to be forward funded. The budget period length is going to be one, three-year budget period. And the project period is going to match that: three years.

There is going to be no match requirement in this particular program announcement.

The key dates you want to be aware of is the deadline for submission of application is going to be 11:59 pm Eastern Standard Time on July 31, 2012.

The anticipated issuance of Notice of Grant Award is September 28, 2012. And the start date is September 30, 2012.

I would urge you to submit to grants.gov in advance a suggested minimum amount of five days prior to the application closing date. There are quite a few federal agencies right now working with grants.gov and we want to be sure that you have submitted your application in time because no late applications will be accepted.

I also want to bring to your attention in the program announcement that these funds are prevention and public health funds which is the source of funding for this particular announcement. This means that it's going to result in some key changes in reporting and grants requirements such as cap on salary. But none of the funds can be used to pay a salary of an individual through a grant cooperative agreement or other external mechanism at a rate in excess of executive level two which is 179,700. This does not mean that the salary itself is capped. It means our funds in this program announcement is used to pay for that salary is capped. Please be sure to read the program announcement with the cited additional requirements for this particular funding.

And Stephanie do you have anything else that you'd like to say?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: The only other thing that I would add is that on the key date, the deadline for submission: try to submit early.

Heather Wiley: Yes.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: If you are having any difficulty submitting, the only evidence - and Heather can correct me, the only evidence that our grants office accepts as evidence that you tried to submit and you couldn't is actually an email error message that is generated from the system that you receive via email that is very clear and specific on what the problem was. Is that correct Heather?

Heather Wiley: Yes.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay. There are no other exceptions or excuses or reasons that we could accept any late applications.

Great. Meg or Barbara do you have anything to add before we open it up to - okay great. Thank you very much.

So (Calvin) we're ready to take questions.

Coordinator: Thank you. At this time if you would like to ask a question please press Star 1 on your telephone keypad. That's Star 1 to ask a question. Please record your name at the prompt so I may introduce your question. One moment please.

Our first question comes from (Marni). Your line is open.

(Marni): Thank you. I have two quick questions can funds from this grant be used in long term care facilities?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: And do you want to go ahead and ask your other question?

(Marni): Oh, the second question is can we use funds to do public service announcements?



Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay so the second one is the easier one at this point. A public service announcement is typically considered a primary prevention activity. If you go to Page 54 of the attachment, you see it'd be considered a universal preventive intervention targeted to the general population not based on any individual risk factors. So generally the answer would be no in terms of a public service announcement.

It's definitely up to you to determine whether in your overall proposal you would include any public service announcement. However, you need to consider the amount of funding you have and your ability to develop a robust proposal that can help build the evidence base and the knowledge base and whether a primary prevention / universal prevention intervention like a public service announcement would actually achieve those goals.

In terms of whether the funds could be used in a long term care facility they're not restricted against it per se. I again refer you to the Funding Opportunity Announcement where we talk about identifying the target population, looking at the risk factors, and looking at what a selective or indicated prevention activity might be. And then, if you believe that a prevention activity targeted towards elder abuse in a facility would fit within that criteria, then you certainly can make the proposal for that. But you would need to again provide a very strong rationale and justification for what you're proposing.

Finally, I would also refer you to the project narrative where there is a very, I'd say, lengthy discussion on what the reviewers are going to be looking for in terms of rationale and justification.

(Marni): Great, thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Gail). Your line is open.

(Gail): Thank you. We just need a clarification. On Page 19 of application it indicates the project narrative must not exceed 30 pages.

On Page 23 it says project narrative is ten to 20 pages with 20 pages as the maximum length.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Right that was a mistake that we had mentioned this a little earlier. The project narrative was expanded to 30 pages as a page limit because of all the additional specification and detail that we've asked for. So the page limits for the narrative is 30 pages.

(Gail): Thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You're welcome.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Joe). Your line is open.

(Joe): Yes thank you. Further clarification on what constitutes a state agency. If there's a state university that wishes to apply do they need either a letter from the governor stating that they're part of the executive branch or do they need a letter from the state unit on aging saying they are a state agency? Hello?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: We're clarifying internally just...

(Joe): Oh I'm sorry. Sure.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay thank you. We're just clarifying. So obviously the governor's office would have the authority to write such a letter. You - but it doesn't

have to be from the governor. It can be from an executive branch agency like a state unit on aging. Of course they would need the authority to write that letter and they would be the ones who would determine whether they can appropriately write that letter or not.

Heather Wiley: You want to get that letter from the governor. But we do realize that some states do not - some governors in some states do not like writing such letters. This is why we're clarifying for you that it has to be a letter from someone that has some authority behind it.

(Joe): Sure.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: And just a little bit of background because you certainly are not the only person that's been asking this question. The way that the funding opportunity was structured is that actually there are a number of options that can be selected in the description of who is an eligible applicant. And the only one that we were permitted to select was a state government entity. But they also had a separate entry for state controlled or funded institutions of higher learning. And we were not permitted to select that specifically. So, by default a state university is not eligible.

However we do understand the status of many state universities and that they are recognized as a state governmental entity. And so for us to cover our bases we're requiring either a letter from the governor if the governor's office would provide that or, as you had indicated for instance in your state, if the state unit on aging, which is part of the executive branch, would be willing to write that letter, that would be acceptable as well.

It doesn't have to be the state unit on aging. It could be any executive branch agency.

(Joe): Thank you I understand. I have a second question as well. Will ACL consider awarding more than one grant to a state such as California if we've applied for two grants?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: We are able to consider awarding multiple grants to a state. We also have in the FOA that the decisions will be based on a number of criteria. And one of them is geographic distribution. Ideally, we would have a multiple states represented. However, let's say California submits two applications and they rank one and two and they're 20 points higher than the third ranked application, we would seriously consider funding both of them.

What we want to do is produce the best grants possible. And we would not necessarily skip an excellent application simply because it's from a state that already has an application that was ranked high. I hope that wasn't too confusing.

(Joe): No, thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: We would consider funding multiple awards to one state.

(Joe): Very good. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Jodi). Your line is open.

(Jodi): My question's been answered. It was related to the page limit. Thanks for clarifying.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Tony). Your line is open.

(Tony): Hi. I have a two questions. In terms of providing services for potentially high risk folks in their home would something like emergency homemaker services be available? And also would there be funds to pay psychologists for a decisional capacity assessment if it if worse came to worse? And then I have one other question but let me stop there for now.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: So your first question is I don't - I'm sorry. Are you asking if the funds can be used to pay for homemakers or are you asking if there's a partner program that would provide sort of supportive services to whomever you offer the intervention to?

(Tony): We would be working with the partner agencies some of which have those services but they're already I think the folks are on a two year waiting list for it. And if we really get into the trenches, you know, with some of the new higher risk folks who are prevention and we stumble across somebody who needs it can we use project funds to pay for homemaker services is basically...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: The project funds are to be used exclusively for the proposed intervention. If you're proposing homemaker services as part of your intervention and you provide specifics in the rationale, and it's part of your application as reviewed and awarded, then you've already answered your own question: that service is part of your intervention and allowable.

If you're asking about subsequent supportive services that are required by individuals that you've identified through the intervention, those services would be outside of the scope of your proposed...

(Tony): Hello? Hello?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Sorry we accidentally put you on mute.

(Tony): Okay.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: I'm sorry I got sidetracked when we put you on mute by accident.

The supportive services as a need, as a subsequent need that was identified through your intervention... that would not be an allowable expense of these funds if they were not directly related to the intervention that you proposed and that was reviewed and approved.

(Tony): Okay I understand. That makes sense.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: And what was your second question then? I'm sorry?

(Tony): The second question has to do with some what we would anticipate software cost to be. We're using Harmony database in New Mexico and have for 2000 - since 2009. It's likely we would use our current database for this project but we have no report writing...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Right I'm going to interrupt you real quick. Let me ask you. In your proposal, you would include any costs that you anticipate to be associated with implementing your intervention. If you determine that an important part of your intervention that you're proposing to prevent elder abuse would include either creation or the modification of a current data system, then you would need to include that in your budget and in your proposal so that it could be reviewed and approved.

It's not necessarily an unallowable expense, but again your budget will be reviewed and scored by the reviewers in terms of the appropriateness of the use of funds. I'm not saying that data systems are not an appropriate use. I just want you to understand that whatever you propose needs to be very strongly justified as necessary for you to implement a very successful prevention intervention because everything will be scored.

(Tony): Okay thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You're welcome.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Kate). Your line is open.

(Kate): Hi. Thank you. In the instructions and in your verbal mentioning of the logic model you referred to a diagram. The sample however on the last page of the RFP looks more like a Word document. So I'm just wondering if you can clarify what kind of diagram you're looking to see for the logic model?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes it's funny that you note that. Our example did not look like this when we started out. It had pretty arrows. And it was a very nice object. But, we were under great pressure in terms of time and in order to make it compliant with Section 508 of the American Disabilities Act, we turned it into a table.

You would not in your application be constrained by those same requirements. You don't have to do it as a chart like this. If you if your logic model has more circles and arrows and guidelines and dotted lines and whatever that's totally fine. It can be whatever you envision it to be. It's supposed to be a visual representation of your project.

(Kate): Okay thanks.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Brian). Your line is open.

(Brian): Yes I have two questions basically. My first question is are you basically encouraging like state entity offices to apply? Would it say for example local area agencies (on agents) within individual states be able to apply under their adult protective services department?

And my next question is what's the link online to at least review if not download the application for the grant?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: So the authority for this funding limits it to state government entities which is very distinct from county or local government entities. A local area agency on aging would not be able to apply itself unless it had a letter from the governor or the executive branch that indicated that it was applying on behalf of the state because a local area agency on aging is clearly not a state government entity. Unless of course, it could be set up that way in a particular state that I'm not aware of so I shouldn't speak universally but typically a local area agency on aging would not be able to apply.

The link for the funding announcement is in two places actually. You can access it through <http://www.grants.gov> . You can also access it on the AOA Web site.

Heather Wiley: It's <http://www.aoa.gov> and then you just click on Grants Opportunities and then Funding Opportunities.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: It's the very first one listed at the top of the page at this time.



Heather Wiley: And that's where the FAQs will eventually get...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes.

Heather Wiley: And the transcript, as well.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: That's correct.

(Brian): Thank you.

Heather Wiley: Okay.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: However we are encouraging local organizations who are interested or think that their states should apply to work with their state counterpart or people that they have relationships with at the state to encourage them to apply. In terms of partnering, that would be up to how your state handles such things as partnerships and collaborations. But if you think that there's a role for your state with this FOA we definitely encourage you to be in contact with your state counterpart.

(Brian): Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Alan).

(Alan): Hi. Thank you. On Page 9 of the program announcement it says that applicants must have a partnership in place with the justice system to ensure appropriate connection with legal services organizations and to facilitate reports if any to law enforcement.

Is this - we're trying to figure out what it is that is required and do you need to have a partnership, show a partnership with legal services organizations and law enforcement or is there some flexibility in terms of how this is satisfied?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: There is some flexibility. If you continue to read down a little bit on Page 9 it says that applicants should describe their approach including who within the law enforcement and legal service communities would participate in the nature of that participation and including their (role).

The idea behind this is that because this is selective or an indicated prevention activity there's a very high probability that you are going to be working with individuals who are victims of abuse and exploitation. You may also come across criminal activity - and this is often handled through your own IRB when you're doing things. But it was important to the people including us who were developing the program announcement that we be very clear that we would expect there to be a relationship with the justice system to serve the victim.

So if there was a criminal activity that was discovered, or if it was deemed for instance civil legal services would be an appropriate referral, then in terms of ethically how do you serve your victim we wanted to be very clear that we had an expectation that that would be included in your proposal.

Now a further partnership in terms of a more active role in the intervention, that is not required. So for instance a prevention activity targeted towards -I think there was example in here around state guardianship- that is not a requirement. You are not necessarily required to do an intervention targeted at the justice system or necessarily to do an intervention that directly involves the justice system. You may if you wish but you are not required to.

The only requirement is that you have a mechanism in your proposal in which to serve victims who either need civil legal services or who might need a referral to law enforcement because of being a victim of criminal activity.

(Alan): Thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Are there more questions? We have more time.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Jennifer). Your line's open.

(Jennifer): Hi I'm following up on that same question actually. Can you give any more information about the role the legal services could play and how funding might work for that?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Unfortunately not really. That's really up to you to determine in terms of what role you would see them playing in the intervention that you would have. It could be something as simple as an MOU between you and the local legal aid or your legal services for the elderly, the private bar referral service -- something of that sort --to where you could refer clients that would need civil legal services that you come across in your intervention. Or, something much more involved and integrated as the example I'd given related to guardianship, where you might actually have an active participant who might receive funding as a partner within your proposal.

So it really just depends on what your prevention intervention would entail. But the civil legal services are not excluded from being able to receive funding if you include them as a partner in your intervention if that was determined to be appropriate by you all.

(Jennifer): Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Zach). Your line is open.

(Zach): Hi. Yes if you receive multiple proposals from different states focused on preventing a specific type of elder abuse is likely that you'll only fund one of those proposals?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: No. No that's not the case. We really are going to defer primarily to the reviewers who look at each application independently and individually based on the review criteria. They're not pooled together and then a determination made as to which one's the best for this type of prevention of this type of elder abuse or this risk factor. Each application is supposed to be reviewed independently. If the top eight applications all deal with financial exploitation, then that's what happens. Or if they are varied, that's fine as well. So no, there is no decision being made in terms of variability across types of prevention interventions, type of target population, or type of abuses targeted.

(Zach): Thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You're welcome. Good question. Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Carol). Your line is open.

(Carol): Thank you. My question is about what seems to be missing in the narrative. And usually when I fill out a grant proposal there's a section in there for sustainability of a project is developed. I don't see that here and so I wanted to make sure that that's not something that you're anticipating seeing?

And my second question is on an expansion of an existing program or a new service. And here in our state we have an existing program that addresses prevention of elder abuse but it's not tied into the state at all. It's very much an independent program. Would simply tying it into the state and making it a statewide program where we have the new partners to expand the program be sufficient?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: The reason that you didn't see a section on sustainability is because this is intended to pilot test potential prevention interventions. It's intended to be time-limited and gather information that can help us determine whether a certain type of prevention activity targeted to a certain group or a certain type of abuse is effective. It's not enough money to establish that unilaterally or definitively. Again, it's a pilot. It's enough funding to give us the beginnings of determining whether we ought to encourage other funders, or ourselves in the future if we have more funding, to pursue further evidence of any particular type of prevention intervention.

Even though we're not going to solve the issue of elder abuse, and there will continue to be victims after this grant is over, these grants are not about establishing new programs that will have a life unto themselves after this is over. If they, do that's wonderful. But again, this is a time-limited pilot test.

In terms of expanding a current program or intervention that you have it's not necessarily that you cannot do that. I again would just refer you to the program announcement, refer you to the description on pages - sorry on Pages 6 and 7- and also into the attachment. If you believe that you have a project that fits these descriptions and that would warrant from or benefit from additional funding and evaluation then certainly you should, you know, propose that. You would need to work with the state if you're a local entity to do that. So I hope I answered your question.

(Carol): Yes thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Kate). Your line is open.

(Kate): Hi. You mentioned in the response often older adults and I know general administration on aging funds programs for 60 - people 60 and older. But does it absolutely have to be someone 60 and older is part of the demonstration?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Well this is for elder abuse prevention intervention funds. We do cite the authority within the Older Americans Act for this funding. And that does establish elder abuse at the age 60 except for tribes which I believe is 50. Is that correct?

Meg Graves: Whatever they choose.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: It's whatever a tribe chooses. So, for Option 2, it would be whatever the tribes have established. And they would need to probably just provide a description to the effect of "our tribe has established it at such and such age."

But for Option 1, it would be as defined in the Older Americans Act, which is 60 plus.

(Kate): Okay great. It doesn't have to be a statewide intervention if you were working with a targeted population?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: No; it does not need to be a statewide intervention. We recognize clearly that even though this is a large amount of money up front it is not necessarily enough money to fund a statewide intervention. We anticipated

that most of these applications will focus on either one metropolitan area or small groups within a few metropolitan areas. But no; this does need to be a statewide intervention.

However , one of the reasons the funding was targeted at the state is because it is anticipated that the state is in the unique role to help roll out and replicate any promising practices or best practices that develop. So the idea is that we are involving the key player that would be a responsible in the future for implementing statewide interventions like this. But no; we do not expect this to be a statewide intervention at this time.

(Kate): Thank you.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Mary). Your line is open.

(Mary): Hi. My first question was answered so my second question is do you know who and can you tell us who the evaluator will be?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: No. We don't know. That is going to be done through a separate contractual process that has not been awarded – actually hasn't hit the street yet. So no, at this time we don't know who the national evaluator will be.

(Mary): Okay thanks.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Thank you (Mary).

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (LeeAnn). Your line is open.

(LeeAnn): Yes hi. My question is about the difference between interventions for victims and interventions for potential victims. Both are mentioned in the grant in one

of the examples that you gave previously mentioned helping victims. Is there going to be different weight given to whether it's a prevention of someone who hasn't been victimized versus prevention of further victimization?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Not necessarily. As long as you're - I refer you again to Page 54 and Attachment G. As long as the intervention is either a selective or indicated prevention. And again, I'll just read it for people who don't have it handy:

“A selective preventive intervention is one which is targeted to a subgroup of the population that is determined to be at higher risk for experiencing a phenomena.” So clearly it doesn't say that you have to have been victimized.

“Indicated preventive intervention is targeted to individuals who are displaying detectable signs of a particular phenomena.” So that would be the people who had already been victimized or you have a very high suspicion are victims because they are displaying some sort of sign.

So no: as long as your proposal falls within a selective or indicated preventive activity we aren't assigning any higher weight to one or the other.

(LeeAnn): Okay thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: I also would refer everyone on the call to the footnotes throughout the document where we've cited a number of different resources. One of them is the CDC's Handbook on Injury and Violence Prevention. That one is available through most libraries. It is not available for free download but you can obtain it through libraries or you could order it directly if you wish. It's an excellent resource in terms of violence prevention in multiple populations including elder abuse.



And then the Institute of Medicine was cited as a resource on the discussion about universal, selective, and indicated prevention interventions, which is where the terms originated.

Both of those resources are cited in the attachment as well as in other places throughout the document.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Marsha). Your line is open.

(Marsha): Thank you. I just want to clarify. I understand that the applicants must be states or tribes but may they - may additional partners be nongovernmental entities like...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes.

(Marsha): ...not for profits?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Absolutely. Absolutely. We would actually anticipate that some of the partners would be nongovernmental, local, and/or nonprofit social service agencies in terms of implementing the intervention.

But we also recognize that some states can't identify those partners except through a competitive process themselves. They can't pre-identify them. You aren't going to necessarily be scored any lower if you haven't identified them ahead of time. But if you are in a state -- and I believe California is one of them -- where you have to award funds through a competitive process to the local level then you must - you really should clearly indicate that so that you aren't dinged by the reviewers for not having identified partners up front or not having those partner letters. It's not a problem if that's your state process. You just need to help the reviewers understand that.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Karen). Your line is open.

(Karen): Hi. I think you answered this but I just want to be sure. Can a county welfare organization that has adult protective services unit within apply for this grant?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: No. Not at the local level. Only the state government entity can apply. If you're a local county government with APS, if you want to work with your state APS office on having the state APS office apply you can certainly do that. But, as a County office, no you cannot apply.

(Karen): Thank you.

Coordinator: And one moment for our next question.

The next question comes from (Alan). Your line is open.

(Alan): Thank you. I have to ask why is there such a short timeframe given for submission of this application?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You know, I knew that question was going to come. It is not...

(Alan): It's the middle of the summer it's not a lot...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: I know. It was announced on June 14. We know; we are so sorry.

(Alan): Well my question is has any thought been given to extending this deadline?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: We cannot extend it and here's why. These funds are FY 2012 funds and they must be obligated before the end of the fiscal year. September

28 is the last working day before the end of the fiscal year. And in order to have our review - the minimum amount of time for a review process, the minimum amount of time to have the grants office run through all of their Heather's pointing to herself.

Heather Wiley: Me.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: For Heather to do the budget reviews and make sure that nothing is being proposed that is not allowable and then for it to go through the entire review process and excuse me, the approval process, and that entire chain including - because of public health prevention fund dollars there will be people outside of AOA who need to look at these as well- there is no way to lengthen the amount of time to apply.

We were lucky to get 45 days. We had to fight for that, and greatly apologize for the short notice, and we understand just the tremendous burden this is putting on people to try to pull something like this together that has never been asked for before and something that doesn't have a lot of evidence around it in such a short amount of time.

But please rest assured that our reviewers are experts in the field of violence prevention, implementing community based prevention interventions and, and/or in the area of elder abuse and they understand this. So it isn't as if we are expecting the, A Plus Plus and you're going to be dinged because we get the B grade kind of paper. We all understand the nature of what is being asked and it will be reviewed accordingly.

(Alan): Thank you.

So I know the call is supposed to go till 4:00. We do have more time if there's more questions.

Coordinator: Yes we do have a couple more questions.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: That's fine thank you. Please keep going.

Coordinator: Okay I believe the next question is from (Mel Sazimka). I'm not sure of the pronunciation.

Your line is open.

(Mel Sazimka): Hello?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Hi. We can hear you now.

(Mel Sazimka): Okay this is a budget question. It appears that what we're trying to figure out this is a three year grant as you have indicated it's forward funded. Because it isn't so much a year for the three years it's so much for the three year period we're trying to figure out how you do the budget.

Do you want it on like on the 424 do you want the entire amount we're asking? And we understand then the justification should be by year. But we were just trying to figure out this is a little bit different than the ones you usually issue.

Heather Wiley: You would still want to do year by year. You want to estimate year by year what the funding is going to be - what funding is going to be necessary in order to carry out your program activity.

(Mel Sazimka): Okay. All right thanks.

Heather Wiley: We realize though that it may, you know, you may need a budget amendment later on during the three year period. And that's not going to be an issue but you do want to match your budget with your narrative.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: And I would - this is Stephanie and thank you Heather. And I would refer people also to Page 8. At the top of Page 8 we provide sort of a general time frame of what we think to implement - the planning and implementation would involve. And this can help you in determining your budget as well as in terms of which months would we think that you'd be trying to develop your, you know, excuse me, deploy your intervention and finalizing (??), the months we think that you'd actually be in the field, and then the preparation of a final report and kind of wrap up.

So that might help you in terms of thinking which year would you put more or less funds in.

(Mel Sazimka): As a follow-up to that because your national evaluator is going to want to have some kind of consistency across these projects to actually do some comparisons are you considering some kind of data collection software or something on the national level to get the performance measures you're looking for is that going to be a state responsibility?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: So that would be up to the grantee, the applicant/grantee to determine. We aren't dictating to you your data collection system or how you need to structure that. You would be working with us and a national evaluator to come up with some sort of a - excuse me, a core set of outcome or performance measures that all the projects would be trying to collect some

information on. That would be a very small set so that we can do some comparability across projects.

Most of the data that would be asked for by the evaluator is going to be administrative data that you collect within your current systems. We wouldn't be asking you to modify the systems in order to participate in this grant program. We would just be asking you to provide us the raw data. If you could export it into a comma separated value format or something like that it'd be helpful.

In terms of the specific outcomes for this project, it really would be up to you to determine how you want to collect that data. You would need to report it to us in a way that we can use it but we aren't going to dictate a standardized data collection instrument nor system. We just are going to ask for some common elements

(Mel Sazimka): Okay thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You're welcome.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Mary). Your line is open.

(Mary): So I thought of another question. If the researchers thought it was a good idea and the budget supported it would you be open to having several research sites in a particular state or multistate?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: (Mary) could you be a little more descriptive? I don't think we really understand what you're asking?

(Mary): So obviously to do the research someone is going to be working with folks on the local level and let's use California. If we determined that there were three sites that we wanted to do the research to try this intervention with the subgroup that we had identified in San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego if that was possible again with all the if -- there's lots of ifs -- would that be something that you would entertain...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Oh absolutely. Actually I think a similar question came in a little earlier about whether this needed to be a statewide intervention. And our response is that it did not have to be. It could be in one metropolitan area or it could be in multiple metropolitan areas. It's whatever you all decide in the application would make the most sense.

And of course as you mentioned you would want to justify in your budget that you have the ability to carry out a sufficient quality intervention in multiple sites but yes we absolutely would entertain that.

Now are you asking could you have three coordinated applications one from...

(Mary): No.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay.

(Mary): And then the other question was what if you wanted to do it across multiple states?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Now that is something I don't - so California and Oregon for instance would collaborate on a...

Heather Wiley: There's still going to be a lead applicant. Whomever the lead applicant is would identify.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes.

Heather Wiley: They're partners correct?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes.

Heather Wiley: That's the way read it in the...

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes I mean I don't see any reason why you couldn't do it that way. That would work. That would probably be a more feasible way then trying to have two applications come in separately but yet for a tandem project because then that would tether one to the other.

Mary: So we can only grant funds to one organization?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Right. Did that answer you (Mary)?

(Mary): It sure does. Thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You're welcome. Now you have me intrigued about what you might do.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Erin). Your line is open.

(Erin) Hi. Just had a couple quick questions regarding application then one about the intervention. I don't see on any deadline or anything for a letter of intent so I'm assuming there isn't one...



Stephanie Whittier Eliason: That is correct. We did not require a letter of intent.

(Erin): The other one is there a limit for admin, administrative dollars?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Is - do we set a limit? I have an answer for...

Heather Wiley: There was none. As long as the costs are allowable.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: So to the Grants Office we don't have a grants policy that limits the amount of funds for admin. However it is clearly articulated in the review criteria that the reviewers will score your application based on the feasibility of your budget. If it seems very top heavy on admin and the reviewers deem that there may not be enough money going into the actual intervention, then I would assume that your application would be scored lower.

Heather Wiley: Yes.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: ...That's just one thing to consider. If you think, though, in the way that you do your budget that it's all going to be very staff heavy you would need to provide a very robust budget justification explaining why. For examples, it's because it's paying the people who are actually doing the intervention.

Heather Wiley: It's an advocate office or something to that effect.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Right.

(Mary): Okay. And my last question is about the intervention. And it appears as if we are moving towards at least identifying from either evidence based or evidence informed type of interventions that are effective.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Yes.

(Mary): And there's not a lot of research out there right now to build on. Will the application have a stronger possibility of being on positively if the science is a little more concrete?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: That's a very hard question to answer because it's really how the reviewers are going to evaluate your justification and your rationale. I don't know how to answer that. I would just simply refer you back to what's being asked in the project narrative and the review criteria. Even if there's no evidence, if you can provide a very sound rationale for your intervention I would think that it would be reviewed just as well as an intervention that might have a little bit more evidence.

However, I will refer you to the CDC Handbook the chapter I believe is Chapter 13 but written by Pillemer and Lachs and a few others. It's an exceptional overview of the available literature on prevention interventions. And it's pretty much the same across the board nonexistent. So I don't really think that there's going to be one that is, you know, considered more heavily evidence based than another.

And that also holds true for if you want to translate a prevention intervention from another family violence area to elder abuse. We would not be informing the reviewers to consider that any better or worse than anything else. It's a very legitimate and reasonable thing to do. We've done it in a number of different types of evidence based interventions. If you saw something from

intimate partner violence or child abuse or bullying or teen dating violence or anything like that that you thought would be something appropriate to translate, as long as you provide a very good rationale behind that you at least are in the running.

(Mary): Okay thank you very much.

Coordinator: Our next question comes from (Carol). Your line is open.

(Carol): Thank you. I noticed on Page 35 there's Attachment A it talks about completing the required forms. But I don't see a place to - where we find those required forms?

Heather Wiley: I believe it's an application package that you would download on grants.gov.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Correct.

(Carol): Okay. I thought this was the - I guess I didn't download the application packet.

Heather Wiley: This is the program announcement. There is another package that is the application package. And it's another click on grants.gov or I think we've said that earlier that you can go straight to our Web site and click on Grant Opportunities and it's the very first one.

(Carol): Okay great. Thank you.

Heather Wiley: Yes and everything is there.

Coordinator: And our next question comes from (Kim). Your line is open.

(Kim): Thank you. Can you clarify whether this includes elderly living in their homes or in care facilities or just all elderly 60 and over in general?

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: We did not limit this to just the elderly living in communities. So this would be elderly in general. You would just again need to provide the rationale for whatever target population you are trying to reach.

(Kim): Great thank you.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: You're welcome.

Coordinator: And we're showing no further questions at this time.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay. Everyone we have just - we'll give you ten more seconds to queue in.

Okay. Well thank you everyone who participated on the call today. We hope it's been very helpful. We expect to have the transcripts available next week.

We'll post it on AOA's Web site. And we will continue to collect questions that we get as well as the ones that were discussed today. And we'll compile them into an FAQ document and have that posted on the AOA Web site.

And I believe for Option 2 Meg was going to - were you going to post this on <http://www.olderindians.org> as well?

Meg Graves: Yes.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Okay. So that would be the second resource for people applying for Option 2. Any other questions?

Okay thank you very much.

Woman: Thank you everybody.

Stephanie Whittier Eliason: Bye-bye.

Coordinator: That concludes today's conference. Thank you for your participation. You may disconnect at this time.

END