Buncombe County
Strategic Partnership Grants
FY2021 Application Feedback Survey

1. Were you the primary grant writer for this grant application?

- Yes: 19
- No: 0

2. Was this your organization's first time applying for this grant?

- Yes: 7
- No: 12

3. Has your organization been funded by a Strategic Partnership Grant before?

- Yes: 11
- No: 1
4. How did you hear about Buncombe County's Strategic Partnership Grants?

- County Website: 2
- Newspaper Article: 0
- Facebook, Twitter or Instagram: 1
- County Staff Person: 2
- Individual or Volunteer with m...: 2
- Other: 0

5. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: The grant application was easy to access.

19 Responses
4.74 Average Rating

6. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: The grant timeframe was adequate. (It opened Dec 16, 2019 & was due Feb 14, 2020.)

19 Responses
4.89 Average Rating

7. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: The application questions and overall expectations were reasonable and clear.

18 Responses
4.56 Average Rating
8. How could we improve the written application?

11 Responses

Latest Responses

“Provide an opportunity to illustrate how the project could accomplish ...”

“It’s a good application -- clear questions and generally the character ...”

9. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: I was given adequate time and opportunity to communicate how COVID-19 impacted my original grant application.

19 Responses

★★★★★

4.58 Average Rating

10. I was aware of the optional Grant Writing Workshop that was held January 17, 2020.

- Yes 17
- No 2

11. I attended the Grant Writing Workshop.

- Yes 6
- No 11
12. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: The Grant Writing Workshop was helpful to me.

6 Responses

3.83 Average Rating

13. I was aware of the availability of County staff for basic one-on-one support.

17 Yes
2 No

14. I contacted County staff for basic one-on-one support during the grant application window.

7 Yes
10 No

15. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: I was able to get answers to the questions I had from County staff in a reasonable manner and timeframe.

7 Responses

5.00 Average Rating
16. I was aware of the availability of language assistance (interpreting & translation).

- Yes: 11
- No: 8

17. I contacted County staff to access language assistance during the grant application window.

- Yes: 0
- No: 11

18. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: I was able to access the language assistance I needed in a reasonable manner and timeframe.

0 Responses

0.00 Average Rating

19. I was aware of the availability of Minority Business Plan assistance.

- Yes: 5
- No: 14
20. I contacted County staff to access Minority Business Plan assistance during the grant application window.

- Yes: 0
- No: 5

21. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: I was able to get the Minority Business Plan assistance that I needed in a reasonable manner and timeframe.

- 0 Responses
- 0.00 Average Rating

22. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: There was adequate communication from County staff to my organization between the application deadline and the notification of grants.

- 19 Responses
- 4.79 Average Rating

23. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: There was appropriate transparency in the review process by the Strategic Partnership Grants Committee.

- 19 Responses
- 4.42 Average Rating
24. Please rate from 1 to 5 stars based on how much you agree with this statement: Throughout the process, Strategic Partnership Grants committee members and County staff embodied the County’s values of Respect, Honesty, Integrity, Collaboration and Equity.

18 Responses

★★★★★

4.78 Average Rating

25. How could we improve our communications to you and others like you?

10 Responses

"Rachael and Angelyn are super stars. They are responsive to question..."

26. What would have improved your application experience?

13 Responses

"Our response to the COVID-19 impact did not seem to reach the com..."

"Nothing (see #20 above). "

27. Please name up to 3 positive aspects of the Strategic Partnership Grants process that the County should keep for next year (FY2022).

14 Responses

"1) Clear communications 2) Straightforward application 3) Responsiv..."

"balanced committee which is aware of the impact of all aspects of ou..."

"1 - SPF decisions are made by a committee instead of having 40+ ag..."

28. Please name up to 3 aspects of the FY2021 Strategic Partnership Grants process that the County should change for next year (FY2022).

13 Responses

"Add a focus or subsection of the program for arts and culture. This se..."

"1 - allow for non-construction housing related supportive services to..."
29. Do you plan to apply for future Strategic Partnership Grants? If no, why not?

17 Responses

"Yes"

"Yes, because the need for our services continues and is not a one-tim...

30. This survey is anonymous unless you choose to share your information. If you would like share, please provide the following: Organization Name Your Name Your Email Address

4 Responses

"ASAP Molly Nicholie molly@asapconnections.org"

"Wortham Center for the Performing Arts Rae Geoffrey rae@wortham...

31. I am interested in talking privately with a County staff person about my application experience. (If yes, make sure you've shared your contact info above.)

- Yes: 0
- No: 18
# Buncombe County Strategic Partnership Grants FY2021 Application Feedback Survey

## Narrative Responses

### How could we improve the written application?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A small provision may be allowing an opportunity for grantees and Program Officers to meet ahead during the application period. I.e., grantees could discuss a potential concept, program idea ahead of submitting the application. We find it is often helpful to speak in person (virtually, or by phone) with the most qualified person to help determine if a concept or program is viable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By defining some of the terms (ex: what is meant by formal vs. supportive partners) in the application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a space to attach a limited number of letters of support from organizational partners or community members would help communicate the need for the proposed projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought the application was fine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's a good application -- clear questions and generally the character count per section was sufficient to answer the questions, so I didn’t have to spend hours trying to reduce the character count to fit into the character allotment (That’s a huge deal!).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps combine the results and evaluation sections as they are more related than different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an opportunity to illustrate how the project could accomplish or complement more than one of the County's strategy areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really appreciated the optional questions. None of the questions in the written application seemed any different from other standard grant questions, so we felt prepared to answer all of them. Sometimes is it nice to be able to add a story of a client to help paint a picture of the program we are requesting funding for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectation to respond quickly to extensive questions from the committee at the height of the pandemic was unexpected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How could we improve our communications to you and others like you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications were fine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the communication was great and opportunities to reach out were provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no suggestions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing to change. Communications were very clear and timely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael and Angelyn are super stars. They are responsive to questions, offer helpful advice, and willing to look for creative approaches to meeting community needs. They are fabulous to work with and never make my questions or requests feel like impositions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to question #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the questions asked by the committee seemed to indicate that they had not thoroughly read the application. Some question were similarly-worded version of the same question. And a few questions seemed to be about the opinion of committee members about how the program should be run, which doesn’t seem to respect the expertise of non-profits. It would feel more respectful of time that non-profits invest in the process for county staff to filter these questions or put parameters on them. Also, proving just a few days to answer extensive and unexpected questions about the application during the immediate pandemic crisis did not feel respectful or collaborative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes the information was on your website, before it was communicated to the applicants. I would rather have heard from you first that we did not get the grant, rather than seeing it on your website first.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The county's strategic plan is broad. It'd be helpful to understand if there are specific areas of the plan we should be considering and focusing on.

What would have improved your application experience?

- Actually getting the grant ;)
- Seriously though, the process and experience was fine. I appreciated the transparency and being able to see the matrix, etc.
- Can't think of anything.
- Experience was fine.
- In the past there has been an opportunity to present information to the Board about our organization. I understand that there is now a citizens committee to review and make recommendations as well as the Covid pandemic, but if in the future I would hope that opportunity could be reinstated.
- N/A
- no suggestions
- Not sure.
- Nothing (see #20 above).
- Our response to the COVID-19 impact did not seem to reach the committee as a whole prior to the determination session, resulting in negative feedback. Otherwise the process was very smooth and effective. Thank you!
- Refer to question #7
- To have received a confirmation of submitted application email. If I recall, I ended up leaving a voicemail message in an attempt to ensure it came through.
- To understand more about the criteria used to make funding decisions.
- We were asked to tie our proposals to the County’s strategic plan, which was somewhat in flux during the RFP window. Having a clear and complete county plan will improve our ability to see how we can best pursue mutual goals and interests.

Please name up to 3 positive aspects of the Strategic Partnership Grants process that the County should keep for next year (FY2022).

1 - SPF decisions are made by a committee instead of having 40+ agencies/projects make 2 minute presentations to the Commissioners like in the past
2 - ample time from application release to due date
3 - availability and helpfulness of Rachael and Angelyn

1) Clear communications
2) Straightforward application
3) Responsive and helpful staff

1. Great staff. Angelyn and Rachael are very professional, well organized, and friendly.
2. Thoughtful review. We appreciated the probing questions we received and the opportunity to clarify certain points.
3. Clear process, clear timeline. The process was much more transparent than in the past, and the county delivered on what they promised.
1. Optional questions, 2. Opportunity to answer follow up questions after application deadline, 3. Opportunity to partner with staff on contract language

Application length was not too burdensome, communications from staff are always helpful, timeline for application completion was fine.

Balanced committee which is aware of the impact of all aspects of our community transparency communication

Budget form
Online interface (with the ability to log-in and save work)
Access to one-on-one support

Good communication
Clear process
Clear timeline

Having the citizen committee review the proposals.
That the committee asked questions for clarification.
The online meeting of funded organizations.

I like that community members, and not just county staff are reviewing applications. It seems much more equitable and transparent, and less about who-knows-who.

I think the overall process was better than years before. Keep up the good work.

Keep the timelines for announcing grant to due date. Keep staff available to speak with grantees. Keep the grant reviewing team structure.

The online application was user friendly and efficient
My Program Officer was knowledgeable and professional
My Program Officer was culturally sensitive and treated me with respect

Transparency; the workshop; the matrix being public

Please name up to 3 aspects of the FY2021 Strategic Partnership Grants process that the County should change for next year (FY2022).

1 - allow for non-construction housing related supportive services to be included in SPF application (instead of having to go into AHSP)
2 - it would be terrific if a program could get initial funding from an SPF grant and after 2-3 years of successful outcomes and proven need, the County could convert the grant to a contract for the service; that would free up funding for other projects/programs and give strong, quality programs a reliable funding source and reduce time spent in the grant application process
3 - centralize the Aging Services Grant management (which just moved from Land of Sky) under Rachael/Angelyn

Add a focus or subsection of the program for arts and culture. This sector, which is crucial to our region's identity and economic health, and has been devastated by the pandemic. It is difficult for arts and culture to compete in the same critical need pool as health and human services.

Add an optional story, or optional support letter that we can attach to the application.

Adding space for letters of support in the online application.
The three-year limit for funding.

Giving all applicants the chance to answer the questions posed by the review committee, rather than just the top applications; communicating to applicants the final application status before posting it on the website;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see nothing significant to change. I review and pursue dozens of grant opportunities every year. This one was among the best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It might be due to my own lack of understanding, but I didn't feel that the process with the new review committee was very transparent. But, maybe it doesn't need to be more transparent? I just don't really know anything about that aspect of it this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure how to improve communications about the grant to the nonprofit sector, perhaps sending announcement to Nonprofit Pathways to post or to the AFP organization. Include grantwriting workshop date with announcement and contact info for questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly host a virtual grant writing workshop for those interested but unable to attend in-person during the designated time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put more parameters around the follow up questions from the committee/have those filtered by county staff. Let agencies know in advance when they will receive questions and when answers will be due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be site visits prior to making funding determinations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>