

D5160
2012-13 Grant Review Summary and Recommendations
March 27, 2015

The 2014/15 District/Community Grant Review Team reviewed 7 Grants from the 2012-13 approval year. Those Grants included:

<u>Club</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Berkeley	ESL for Golden Gate Field workers	\$12000
Dixon	Teen Center PA and security systems	\$6500
Dixon	Computer Net Books	\$4500
Paradise	Play structure	\$10000
Weaverville	Update skilled nursing facility	\$20000
Redding Riv. Sun.	Sunset Robotic Surgical Equipmt	\$9750
Richmond	Tales of the Lost Triangle	\$10000
	Total:	\$72750

Focus Items:

Literacy: 3
Health: 2
Community Dev: 2

Review Logistics: We started this process on Feb 3rd communicating with all 7 club Presidents/Foundation Chairs introducing our process and objectives, and setting meeting dates. It took 45 days and 836 miles of travel, a few meals and lots of conversation to complete our reviews. The Review Team consisted of PP Bradley Ward, RC of San Pablo, and PDG Mark von Hoetendorff, RC of San Ramon.

Review Summary: All of the Grants we reviewed met their stated goals as applied for. Grants were completed and money used as specified in their applications. There were two cases of excess funds. One club sent those funds back to the District as directed, the other club sent the funds to a foundation associated with the grant. The Review Checklist was our guide and helped the Grantees prepare their Review packages for our review. Each grant review (documents/financials) takes about 1 hour and the on site review, if different than the doc/financial review (RI logos/advertising/physical observation), another 30-45 minutes. The clubs were very cordial about our visit. Generally the people who led the project, the current President, sometimes the Foundation Chair, and rarely the PE for 2015/16 (this is how to apply and complete a grant) attended. We invited the Grant leadership team, current President, Foundation Chair, Past President (when the grant was implemented), and the PE for educational purposes. For the most part most clubs were very well prepared, some in greater depth than others.

Grant Documents: We found that all the clubs had a solid package of documents, applications, emails, approval letters, a list of Rotarians involved,

and an overview of the project was provided. The review Team packages were generally much better than the first two years of Grant Reviews.

Grant Financials: Some clubs were very detailed about their financials and we were able to see the flow of expenses and revenues as the grant was completed. Other clubs took a less detailed approach but for the most part had the detail we needed to verify expenses and revenues and what they were used for. The difference is a matter of who was preparing the review package and how much financial experience they have.

Grantee Responsibilities: In some cases the advertising, promotion, and communication of Rotary's involvement in the project was excellent, in a couple of cases, little was done to communicate Rotary's involvement. In addition the sustainability of a grant was in a few cases very hard to determine. A playground set is obviously easy to determine how long that will last and how many kids will use it over a period of years. Robotic surgical equipment is also easy to determine the number of surgical operations, and how long it will last. It is not easy to determine sustainability for literacy projects and what the long term affect is on the group receiving the training/education.

Expenditures: As noted above, we were generally able to follow the grant expenses and revenues from beginning to end. In some cases more depth was required.

Retention: We suggested that the clubs retain their original documents for three years. In all cases they had bundled their original package and gave us a copy to review.

Recommendations for Future Reviews:

Team Size and timing of reviews: The Review team must (per R.I.) be composed of a PDG, and should be two other experienced Rotarians, Past Presidents if possible. Financial and District Grant background would be very helpful. Grant Reviews should be done 1 ½ - 2 years after approval. Grants, most of the time, do not get completed within six months of approval and funding. Usually it requires a cross over Rotary year to complete. It really depends on the project and its complexity. However weather, transportation, storage issues, manufacturing issues, late deliveries, regulatory requirements, building inspectors, and city zoning/codes can delay completion. The District needs to follow up with clubs for reasonable completion dates, and have written agreements as to when a project will complete.

Documents: No suggestions.

Financials: We have a "Financials" format model that we strongly suggest would save the clubs a lot of time in prep for a review, and reduce the review team's time as well. See attachment #1. In addition we suggest that for larger projects that the grant project financial point person, not be the club treasurer (too busy), and should have online read only access to the project dedicated

bank account This will provide a real time window of project expenses, processed checks and deposits, and transaction statements.

Rotary Recognition: This remains an area that the District needs to provide significantly more guidance and suggestions for each grant that is approved. The application should clearly state what the club will do to recognize the local Rotary club's involvement and what advertising, promotional posters, postcards, TV, newspaper, and local news will be involved. What is their plan to use R.I. logos on the project, plaques in a room, or at the location if outdoors etc. to clearly communicate that Rotary contributed this project to their city? The approval letter should reiterate those agreements.

Sustainability: This is another area the District needs to provide clear instructions and suggestions when they approve a grant for literacy/educational projects. This kind of grant is very worthwhile but needs some structure when it comes to sustainability. When the District approves a literacy grant it should be clear what the expectations are so that the Review Team and the club are both clear and the approved application states that expectation.

Grant Types:

If we analyze three grants out of the seven we reviewed, we find three distinct types that will fit most of the grants we have reviewed over the past three years:

1. The traditional grant was the ABC grant. This club was the project lead. They received the District grant, added funding from other sources and disbursed the funds as invoices were received. They kept a separate set of books and produced project financials. They used professional tradesmen as needed. What they didn't record was the number of in kind hours the club spent on the project.

2. The second type was the DEF grant. The local club received the funds and then wrote a check to Paradise Recreation & Park District (PRPD). PRPD was the lead. They received funds from various sources, purchased the play structure and installed it with their maintenance staff. What percentage of the total project the district grant was we don't know as we never received any project accounting.

The local club did provide in kind hours during the construction of the play structure but we did not receive any accounting of this. The local club also built, had built, a bulletin board with a Rotary plaque. We do not know if this was part of the project budget or not.

3. GHI was the third type. The district grant was given to a local non-profit that had just started. It appears this was the seed money (catalyst) to sponsor a local golf tournament to raise additional funds for a robotic surgical piece of equipment. Once the local non-profit had raised enough funds through various golf tournaments a donation, by the local non-profit, was given to Mercy's non-profit to go to the hospital for the equipment.

What portion of the grant was for golf tournament fees and operations we do not know as we did not receive any accounting, nor we able to trace the funds. What we do know is that as the result of the District grant a local non-profit was set up that is very successful and could be in competition with the Rotary Foundation.

The District needs to set down guidelines, when the grant is awarded, to see how they want the funds used. If the District is okay with these three styles then it must be stated in the grant documents. The Review Team needs clear guidelines to be able to determine what is acceptable and what is not. Remember, the Review Team, does not make guidelines during the review. They review what was approved.