

Grantee: A New Day, Inc.

Federal Project Officer: Paul Bowser Peer Monitor: Pamela Johnson

Start Date: 10/02/2024 End Date: 10/03/2024

Site Visit Activities

	Yes	No
Did the FPO contact you in advance to plan the visit and set an agenda?	☐	☐
Did the onsite monitoring team (FPO, Peer Monitor, and any additional members clearly explain the purpose/intent and process of the monitoring visit?	☐	☐
Did the team engage in a positive manner with you and your staff throughout the site visit?	☐	☐
Did the team identify possible compliance issues and/or areas for improvement (as applicable) in a timely manner so that you could respond?	☐	☐
Did the team provide appropriate technical assistance during the visit, as needed?	☐	☐
Did the team conduct a closing meeting to summarize strengths or concerns they identified during the visit?	☐	☐

Comments:

Help

Feedback on Federal Project Officer

Feedback on Federal Project Officer: Laura Hubbard

	N/A	Poor	Acceptable	Average	Good	Excellent
Accessibility of FPO (before and/or after the site visit)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flexibility and willingness to work collegially with you and grantee program staff	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
FPO's knowledge of program requirements	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of administration (non-fiscal)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of administration (fiscal)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to provide useful, appropriate TA during the visit	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to verbalize/clarify programmatic recommendations to the grantee while onsite	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to identify any resources to help the grantee carry out team recommendations	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Average Score*: N/A

* Poor = 1, Acceptable = 2, Average = 3, Good = 4, Excellent = 5

Feedback on Peer Monitor

Feedback on Peer Monitor: Pamela Johnson

	N/A	Poor	Acceptable	Average	Good	Excellent
Accessibility of PM (before and/or after the site visit)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Flexibility and willingness to work collegially with you and grantee program staff	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
PM's knowledge of program requirements	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of administration (non-fiscal)	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Knowledge of general RHY needs and RHY program requirements	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to provide useful, appropriate TA during the visit	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to verbalize/clarify programmatic recommendations to the grantee while onsite	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ability to identify any resources to help the grantee carry out team recommendations	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Average Score*: N/A

* Poor = 1, Acceptable = 2, Average = 3, Good = 4, Excellent = 5

YOUR OVERALL IMPRESSIONS

Please identify strengths or extra value the Team brought to the review.

Please identify any areas where you saw a need for improvement:

Would you feel comfortable engaging with this FPO further for information on RHY programming and services? ☐ Yes ☐ No Please tell us why or why not.

Would you engage with this PM as a resource for information on RHY programming and services in the future? ☐ Yes ☐ No Please tell us why or why not.

Submit

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995 (Pub. L. 104-13) STATEMENT OF PUBLIC BURDEN: The purpose of this information collection is to collect feedback on RHY on-site monitoring processes. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 10 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and reviewing the collection of information. This is a voluntary collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB # is 0970-0401 and the expiration date is 05/31/2027. If you have any comments on this collection of information, please contact help@gmatterstech.com.

NOTE: This entire document is one page online and the Paperwork Reduction Act statement is at the end of the document.