

Dear Chief Justice:

RE: Request for Proposals for Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders (WINGS)

The American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging (ABA Commission), in collaboration with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), is conducting a demonstration grant program to establish, enhance, or expand state Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders (WINGS). We invite your court to submit a proposal in partnership with state aging, disability, legal and other key stakeholders by February 28, 2017.

This funding opportunity offers state courts up to \$20,000 to establish, enhance, or expand WINGS (with special provision for up to \$30,000 for selected states with an intensive focus). In addition to funding, successful applicants will receive extensive expert technical assistance and opportunities for information-sharing with other state WINGS.


As terminology differs by state, in this Request for Proposals package, we use the term “guardianship” to refer to guardians of the person and to guardians of property, often called “conservators,” for adults, unless otherwise indicated.

This project is supported by the U.S. Administration for Community Living Elder Justice Innovation Grant Program. The project will support establishment, expansion, and enhancement of state WINGS to improve state guardianship systems, avoid unnecessary guardianship, and prevent and address abuse. It also will identify and evaluate measurable outcomes, facilitating and guiding replication of additional WINGS. These activities are consistent with CCJ/COSCA resolutions supporting development of WINGS and recognizing the need for adult guardianship reform and less restrictive options.

WINGS groups currently exist in 17 states, and have produced valuable resources, enhanced court oversight, and promoted less restrictive options. Equally important, WINGS have forged communication paths among stakeholders, reducing silos among entities serving the same populations.

We encourage your court to submit a WINGS application to advance CCJ and COSCA policy, receive valuable technical assistance, be at the forefront of reform, and increase public trust and confidence in the role of the courts for at-risk individuals who may need support in decision-making.

Sincerely,



Erica Wood, JD
Project Director
ABA Commission on Law and Aging



Brenda Uekert, PhD
Principal Court Research Consultant
National Center for State Courts

Background Information on Working Interdisciplinary Networks Of Guardianship Stakeholders and Their Role in Adult Guardianship Reform

Terminology. As terminology differs by state, in this Request for Proposals package:

- “Guardianship” is used generically to describe a relationship created by state law in which a court gives one person or entity the duty and power to make personal and/or property decisions for an adult whom the court finds lacks ability to make decisions for him or herself (NOTE: this project is not addressing guardianships of minors).
- “Guardianship” refers to guardians of the person and to guardians of property, often called “conservators,” of adults, unless otherwise indicated. Guardians are often family members, but may be willing friends, private or public agencies, professional guardians, attorneys, or financial institutions.

Guiding Principle. Adult guardianship aims to protect at-risk individuals, yet at the same time removes fundamental rights. Thus longstanding recommendations by courts and others, as well as state statutory provisions, generally require that it be a last resort after less restrictive decision-making options have been considered, be limited if possible, and be monitored for accountability.

Need for Reform. “Adult guardianship reform” generally includes the following components: initial consideration of less restrictive options prior to imposition of a guardianship; procedural due process safeguards; a functional determination of an adult’s abilities and need for support; use of limited orders; solid court oversight; collection and maintenance of data; and good guardian standards and training.

Each of these reform components has benefits to the courts, as well as to the at-risk adults and the guardians that are part of the guardianship system. In the past 30 years, states have markedly strengthened their adult guardianship statutes, but implementation in practice has been uneven. Despite efforts to minimize unnecessary use of guardianship, the Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators have confirmed the [growing demands for guardianship](#) with the rising population of older people with dementia and individuals with disabilities—and the increasing strains on courts.

While many guardians are dedicated—and while courts have begun to develop training and monitoring resources—accounts of inappropriate or abusive guardianships still surface. The prevalence of malfeasance is unknown, as there is very little data. On November 30, 2016, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), which had previously highlighted [cases of financial exploitation, neglect, and abuse by guardians](#), issued a [new report](#) that discussed the lack of data tracking abusive guardianships, the reasons for the inadequate data, and efforts to resolve the problem. On December 1, 2016, the CCJ/COSCA Joint Committee on Elders and the Courts adopted the [Adult Guardianship Initiative](#) as a blueprint to guide court reform in this area.

Reform Efforts. A groundbreaking 1987 *Associated Press* (AP) series triggered modern guardianship reform, contending that “overworked and understaffed court systems frequently break down, abandoning those incapable of caring for themselves.” Following the AP report, three landmark multidisciplinary consensus conferences (“Wingspread” in 1988, “Wingspan” in 2001, and the Third [National Guardianship Summit](#) in 2011,) served as an engine driving needed reform.

At the same time, other substantial efforts sought to enhance individual autonomy and improve guardian performance—a 1997 revision of the Uniform Guardianship and Protective Proceedings Act, with another currently underway; a 2013 revision of the National Guardianship Association *Standards of Practice*; a 2013 update to the *National Probate Court Standards*; and creation by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) of a Center for Elders and the Courts.

Effecting permanent guardianship reform is an uphill battle because: (1) practices differ significantly by state and by court; (2) cases are complex—often fraught with issues of mental illness, medication, family discord, undue influence, abuse and exploitation, service provider fragmentation, and lack of resources; (3) guardians constantly walk a fine line negotiating risks, protections, and self-determination, generally with little guidance; and (4) funds, data, and research are scarce.

State Court/Stakeholder Action. A central tenet of the broad-based 2011 Summit convened by the National Guardianship Network (NGN)—as well as earlier recommendations dating back to 1988—was that guardianship reform can best be accomplished by ongoing state court-stakeholder partnerships for problem-solving and action. The Summit urged that states develop collaborative Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders (WINGS) to advance adult guardianship reform and promote less restrictive options.

Existing WINGS Collaborations. To pilot WINGS, NGN—with coordination by the American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging (ABA Commission), and support from the State Justice Institute and other sources—named four states to receive WINGS start-up funds and technical assistance in 2013, and five states in 2015. In addition, eight other states have created similar collaborative entities. Each of the 17 [WINGS](#) has convened cross-disciplinary meetings and formed ongoing workgroups engaged in specific reform objectives.

While still in the early stages, WINGS have produced valuable resources, enhanced court oversight, and promoted less restrictive options. But just as important, WINGS have forged communication paths among stakeholders, reducing silos among entities serving the same populations. An initial assessment by NCSC in 2015 found WINGS to be “a feasible and effective means for addressing the current shortcomings of the guardianship system. . . .” [WINGS resources](#) include the following:

- WINGS Tips: State Replication Guide for Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders, National Guardianship Network (2014)
- *Video Introduction to WINGS Replication Guide*, featuring Hon. Eric Washington, Chief Judge for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and Past-President of the Conference of Chief Justices (2015)
- Assessment of the Impact and Efficacy of Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders, Van Duizend, R. & Uekert, B., National Center for State Courts (2015)

Finally, to lay groundwork for communication between state courts and the federal Social Security representative payee program, the Social Security Administration (SSA) has designated regional representatives for each of the WINGS states, has convened periodic calls, and developed a judicial training guide on the representative payee system. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) also has designated regional WINGS contacts.

New Support for WINGS. Supported by the U.S. Administration for Community Living Elder Justice Innovation Grant Program, the ABA Commission, in collaboration with the NCSC, is conducting a demonstration grant program to establish, enhance, or expand state WINGS. This project moves to a new level efforts to address comprehensive adult guardianship reform and target less restrictive options

through WINGS. It provides significant funding and expert technical assistance to states that will establish, enhance, or expand WINGS to benefit both the aging and disability populations. See the attached Request for Proposals for specific information about purpose, eligibility, funding options, grant conditions including budget and reporting requirements, the technical assistance and resources that will be provided to recipients, the selection process, and the application process.

In the child welfare system, the [Court Improvement Program](#) (CIP) provides a permanent structure for federal funding to states to convene stakeholders, formulate priorities and strategic plans, and coordinate improvements with outcome measures. The CIP could offer a viable long-term model for adult guardianship/decision-making reform, and WINGS must be positioned with rigorous outcome measurement and data collection to move toward that model.

Request for Proposals to Establish, Enhance or Expand Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders

Table of Contents

- I. GRANT INFORMATION 6
 - A. Funding Opportunity Description..... 6
 - B. Purpose..... 6
 - C. Eligible Applicants..... 6
 - D. Grant Options. 6
 - E. Application Length and Format. 7
 - F. Grant Conditions..... 7
 - G. Project Technical Assistance and Resources for WINGS. 8
 - H. Chart of WINGS Project Responsibilities. 9
 - I. Project Evaluation..... 9
 - J. Budget Requirements..... 9
 - K. Match Requirements. 10
 - L. Reporting Requirements. 10
 - M. Application Review and Rating 10
 - N. Submission and Deadline. 10
- II. APPLICATION COMPONENTS 11
 - A. New WINGS 11
 - 1. Applicant Information 11
 - 2. Statement of Need Questions for New WINGS States 11
 - 3. Project Approach Questions for New WINGS States 11
 - B. Existing WINGS 12
 - 1. Applicant Information 12
 - 2. Statement of Need Questions for Existing WINGS States 12
 - 3. Project Approach Questions for Existing WINGS States 12
 - C. Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options 13
 - 1. Applicant Information 13
 - 2. Statement of Need Questions for Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options 14
 - 3. Project Approach Questions for Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options..... 14
 - D. Focus WINGS on Court Oversight..... 15
 - 1. Applicant Information 15
 - 2. Statement of Need Questions for Focus WINGS on Court Oversight..... 15
 - 3. Project Approach Questions for Focus WINGS on Court Oversight 16
 - E. Work Plan Information and Form for All Applicants 17
 - F. Budget Information and Form for All Applicants 18
 - G. Organizational Information Form for All Applicants 20
- III. Appendix A - Chart of WINGS Project Responsibilities 24

Request for Proposals to Establish, Enhance or Expand Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders

Application Due Date: February 28, 2017

I. GRANT INFORMATION

A. Funding Opportunity Description.

Although existing Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders (WINGS) have considerable momentum, there is a need for more consistent strategic planning, outcome measures, ongoing technical assistance, better cross-state exchanges, and evaluation. There is also a need for WINGS in additional states.

The Administration for Community Living (ACL), through its Elder Justice Innovation Grant Program, has funded the American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging (ABA Commission), in partnership with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), to promote and assist state WINGS. As terminology differs by state, in this Request for Proposals “guardianship” refers to guardians of the person and to guardians of property, often called “conservators,” of adults.

B. Purpose.

The purpose of this funding opportunity is to establish, expand, and enhance multidisciplinary efforts to improve a state’s guardianship system, avoid unnecessary guardianship, and prevent and address abuse through state WINGS. As a result of this demonstration funding, we expect the grantee to develop and implement WINGS as a replicable model and test it through empirical outcome measurement.

C. Eligible Applicants.

Eligible applicants are the highest court of each state, in partnership with a broad range of key state stakeholders. (See below for more details.)

D. Grant Options.

From the ACL project funds designated for WINGS grants to state courts, we will determine the number of states and specific funding amounts allocated for each of the following grant options. Courts can apply under for only one option.

- New WINGS. State courts that have not yet convened stakeholders in a WINGS or similar ongoing court-stakeholder partnership for guardianship reform. Each state may apply for up to \$20,000, plus project technical assistance, for establishing a new WINGS over a 12-month period.
- Existing WINGS. State courts that already have established a WINGS partnership, either through NGN start-up funding or at their own initiative, and wish to enhance or expand it. Each state may apply for up to \$20,000, plus project technical assistance, for enhancing or expanding an existing WINGS over a 12-month period.
- Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options and on Court Oversight. State courts that already have established a WINGS partnership, either through NGN start-up funding or at their own initiative,

and wish to enhance and expand it, and in addition aim to develop an intensive, targeted effort in either of two areas: (1) promotion of less restrictive options to avoid the need for guardianship, including supported decision-making; or (2) court oversight practices. Courts applying under the Focus WINGS option must explain how the proposed activities in the Focus area will go above and beyond the envisioned accomplishments for existing WINGS, such that they justify the need for the extra funds. A state with an existing WINGS may apply for up to \$30,000, plus project technical assistance, as a Focus WINGS over a 12-month period.

For each of the grant options, the 12-month award will be divided into two phases. The first phase of funding will be from June 1, 2017 through September 29, 2017. The second phase, beginning on September 30, 2017 through May 31, 2018, is contingent on satisfactory progress of the grantee and subject to continued support by ACL.

E. Application Length and Format.

Applications may not exceed seven (7) pages, excluding the Work Plan Form, Budget Form, Organizational Information Form, and Letters of Commitment. Line spacing may not be less than 1.5, margins may not be less than 1", and applicants must use a standard font size of not less than 11, preferably Times New Roman or Arial.

Letters of commitment from mandated stakeholders (see below) are required. The letters must be on the letterhead of the committing agency, and must specify the agreement to serve in a stakeholder capacity and indicate any particular resources it will provide in support of the WINGS initiative. Letters of commitment or support from additional stakeholders are encouraged.

F. Grant Conditions.

State court WINGS applications must demonstrate how the courts and community partners plan to make measurable progress beyond their current status and reinforce their efforts to date. Additionally, the applications must indicate how the court will meet each of the following conditions:

1. Court Support and Role. The state's highest court will demonstrate that the chief justice supports the project and that the court will have the primary role and responsibility for administration of the project.
2. Inclusive Approach. Demonstrate that the WINGS strategic plan will cover the spectrum of reform, balancing objectives to address abuse with objectives to promote less restrictive options including supported decision-making; and will target both aging and disability populations. (Proposals for Focus WINGS must include additional objectives above and beyond the objectives for existing WINGS.)
3. Stakeholders. Mandatory partners include the state unit on aging, state protection and advocacy agency or state developmental disabilities council, state adult protective services agency, and representatives that the Social Security Administration and the Veterans Administration already have designated (for existing WINGS) or have agreed to designate (for new WINGS). A broader range of stakeholders is encouraged but is not mandatory.
4. Target Disadvantaged Populations. Demonstrate how the strategic plan will target non-English speaking populations, as well as other socially or economically disadvantaged populations.
5. Staffing and Coordination. Designate a paid staff coordinator and a working steering committee for planning meetings and moving the group forward.

6. Timely Launch and Regular Meetings. Convene the WINGS group within two months of award to begin developing a strategic plan for a new WINGS or to refine a strategic plan for an existing WINGS. The proposal may anticipate elements of the strategic plan, but the actual priorities and tasks will result from the group's discussion. A new WINGS may wish to assess statewide priorities prior to the meeting through a stakeholder survey. WINGS groups should aim to meet at least quarterly.
7. Outcome Measures; Evaluation. Work with NCSC on formulation of the strategic plan, the development of outcome measures, and data collection.
8. Public Participation. Identify a means for public input into the WINGS process.
9. Project Communication. Accept project technical assistance from the ABA Commission and NCSC, participate in project calls and any site visits, report your state's activities on the WINGS electronic discussion list; and submit required reports outlining barriers, outcomes, and lessons learned.
10. WINGS Forum Participation. Agree that the coordinator will participate in a WINGS coordinator forum during the project's second-year (do not include travel costs in budget as the ABA Commission WINGS project will cover that expense).
11. Sustainability. Agree to develop a plan for sustaining the WINGS group beyond the project period.
12. Project Match. Agree to track stakeholder time and account for other in-kind resources or for cash resources as required project match, and to report the results to the ABA Commission on the form that the ABA Commission will provide.
13. Acknowledgment. Agree to acknowledge the support of the U.S. Administration on Community Living, the ABA Commission, and NCSC in any publications or materials developed under the project, using the verbiage that the ABA Commission will provide.
14. Contract and Budget Requirements. Agree to enter into a subgrant agreement with the ABA and abide by all federal guidelines and budget requirements. The award will be subject to DHHS Administrative Requirements, which can be found in 45 CFR Part 75, and are implemented through the [HHS Grants Policy Statement](#).

G. Project Technical Assistance and Resources for WINGS.

The project will create an infrastructure to support state WINGS through key tools and technical assistance including the following components:

- Kick-off WINGS call and structured calls for WINGS coordinators every other month;
- Coordinator/steering committee launch call for each grantee;
- ABA Commission site visits to new and Focus WINGS states, and NCSC site visits to Focus WINGS states;
- WINGS strategic planning and outcome measurement tools;
- Guidance for WINGS in collaborative, structured review of guardianship abuse cases and distilling lessons learned;

- Ongoing communication with the Social Security Administration and VA on the roles of their WINGS contacts;
- Succinct guardianship resources in key reform areas such as the right to and role of counsel, court-APS interactions, and assessment of abilities and supports; and
- Updated WINGS assessment and replication guide.

The Focus WINGS will receive additional, individualized attention. The project will assist the Focus WINGS to develop preliminary performance measures, to be refined over the course of the project period; and will conduct individual quarterly technical assistance calls with the Focus WINGS coordinator and steering committee.

In conjunction with the tools and technical assistance, the project will facilitate structured opportunities for all WINGS (regardless of whether they are funded under this project) to communicate with each other through the following actions:

- Conduct structured calls for WINGS coordinators every other month;
- Develop and maintain a WINGS website;
- Develop and maintain a WINGS electronic discussion list;
- Convene a WINGS coordinators forum in the second year to address lessons learned, target measurement of outcome-based practices, and showcase WINGS innovations (travel reimbursement only available for WINGS funded under this project).

H. Chart of WINGS Project Responsibilities.

Appendix A offers a chart that lists the responsibilities of the ABA Commission and of NCSC to provide the tools and technical assistance described above. The chart also indicates the responsibilities that the state WINGS have, consistent with the Grant Conditions listed above and described in more detail below, to participate in technical assistance and evaluation activities and to submit required narrative and financial reports, including match information.

I. Project Evaluation.

A requirement of the proposed project is that the court must agree to work with NCSC in: (1) creating a strategic plan; (2) identifying measurable outcomes; and (3) collecting data for outcome measurement. NCSC will train WINGS coordinators on strategic planning and outcome measurement.

In addition, Focus WINGS must work with NCSC on the development of preliminary performance measures for the specified focus area.

Finally, NCSC will conduct two surveys of WINGS stakeholders for an assessment of the capacity of WINGS to accomplish reform objectives and continue as a problem-solving judicial entity.

Your application constitutes an acknowledgement that you understand these requirements and agree to comply. (As participation in the evaluation activities is required, it will not be awarded rating points.)

J. Budget Requirements.

The project period for all WINGS awards will be 12 months. Funding will be made in each phase, contingent on satisfactory progress of the grantee and subject to continued support by ACL. States

seeking support for new or existing WINGS may request up to \$20,000. States seeking support for either Focus WINGS category may request up to \$30,000.

Applications must include a brief budget on the included Budget Form detailing how the funds will be used. Allowable costs include staffing, commissioning research, conducting an initial needs assessment, conducting outreach, developing websites, convening meetings, convening conference calls, and producing publications. The budget must indicate any other resources that will be devoted to supporting WINGS.

K. Match Requirements.

Match is required by ACL. The court must agree to track the time of participating stakeholders and other contributed in-kind or cash resources. For every three (3) dollars received in Federal funding, the applicant must contribute at least one (1) dollar in non-Federal resources toward the project's total cost. The non-Federal resources that can be used as match include, for example, time of participating stakeholders or contributions of cash or services.

The ABA Commission will provide technical assistance about and a reporting form for the match requirement.

L. Reporting Requirements.

The court must submit a progress report, including a narrative and financial report, as well as the required match information, within 30 days after the end of the first phase; and a final report, including a narrative and financial report, with the required match information, within 30 days after the end of the second phase. The ABA Commission will provide forms for the narrative and financial reports.

M. Application Review and Rating.

Applications will be screened by the ABA Commission on Law and Aging for compliance with requirements. Members of the project Advisory Committee—drawn from organizations participating in the [National Guardianship Network](#) as well as additional judicial and other relevant entities—will rate the applications according to the evaluation guidelines set out in the application form below, and the ABA Commission will make the final selections using the ratings as a basis.

N. Submission and Deadline.

Submit the application with supporting letters to the ABA Commission on Law and Aging by email to Erica Wood, Erica.wood@americanbar.org, by February 28, 2017. We anticipate notifying successful applicants on or before May 1, 2017, with an expected project start date of June 1, 2017.

The ABA Commission will acknowledge receipt of the application by email within 24 hours of submission. If you do not receive an acknowledgment of receipt, or for any questions about your application, contact Erica.wood@americanbar.org.

II. APPLICATION COMPONENTS

A. New WINGS

1. Applicant Information

State:

Court Official Submitting Application (Name, title, address, phone, email):

Indicate Whether Letters of Commitment from Mandated Stakeholders are Attached:

1. State unit on aging: _____
2. State protection & advocacy agency and/or developmental disabilities council: _____
3. State adult protective services: _____

[Although the Grant Conditions listed above include representatives of the SSA and the VA as mandated stakeholders, letters of commitment from those agencies are not required for the grant application. Those agencies have either named or committed to name WINGS representatives.]

2. Statement of Need Questions for New WINGS States

(20 of 100 rating points)

1. What are the key problems in your state's adult guardianship system?
2. What have been the efforts to promote guardianship reform and less restrictive options?
3. What collaborations currently exist between the courts and state aging/disability partners?

3. Project Approach Questions for New WINGS States

(40 of 100 rating points)

1. Describe the support, role, and responsibilities of the court in administering the project and implementing the grant conditions set out above.
2. Describe roles and responsibilities of the coordinator and the steering committee that will launch your WINGS effort. Who will comprise the steering committee and how will it function in the proposed project?
3. Describe how WINGS will take the inclusive approach and target disadvantaged populations as required in the grant conditions.
4. How will the steering committee prioritize issues for discussion? What do you anticipate as key issues?
5. What stakeholders will participate in your WINGS?
6. When are you targeting your initial WINGS meeting?
7. How will WINGS function through committees between meetings?

8. How will you engage the public?
9. How will you address turnover in WINGS leadership?
10. How will WINGS garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?
11. How and when will WINGS develop a sustainability plan?

B. Existing WINGS

1. Applicant Information

State:

Court Official Submitting Application (Name, title, address, phone, email):

Indicate Whether Letters of Commitment from Mandated Stakeholders are Attached

1. State unit on aging: _____
2. State protection & advocacy agency and/or developmental disabilities council: _____
3. State adult protective services: _____

[Although the Grant Conditions listed above include representatives of the SSA and the VA as mandated stakeholders, letters of commitment from those agencies are not required for the grant application. Those agencies have either named or committed to name WINGS representatives.]

2. Statement of Need Questions for Existing WINGS States

(20 of 100 ratings points)

1. Describe the origin and composition of your state WINGS group, and the frequency with which it has met.
2. What key guardianship problems has WINGS addressed and what have been the accomplishments?
3. What objectives is WINGS currently targeting?
4. What have been the primary challenges for WINGS and lessons learned?
5. What financial and staffing resources have helped to sustain WINGS?
6. How has WINGS sought to garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?

3. Project Approach Questions for Existing WINGS States

(40 of 100 rating points)

1. Describe the support, role, and responsibilities of the court in administering the project and implementing the grant conditions set out above.

2. Describe the ongoing planning process for WINGS. What have been the roles and responsibilities of the coordinator and the steering committee? Who will comprise the steering committee and how will it function in the proposed project?
3. How frequently has WINGS met, and what is the plan for future meetings?
4. What stakeholders regularly have participated in WINGS, and what, if any, additional stakeholders will be sought?
5. What workgroups has WINGS created; how often have they met, and how often do they plan to meet?
6. What have been the key accomplishments of WINGS?
7. What have been the key obstacles and lessons learned?
8. What are the anticipated key objectives for the proposed project and how will they be met? How does WINGS plan to make measurable progress beyond its current status and reinforce its efforts to date?
9. Describe how WINGS will take the inclusive approach and target disadvantaged populations as required in the grant conditions.
10. How has WINGS engaged the public and how will it do so in the proposed project?
11. How have you addressed or will you address turnover in WINGS leadership?
12. How will WINGS continue to garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?
13. How will WINGS use the funding under this project to ensure or support its sustainability once the funding ends?

C. Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options

1. Applicant Information

State:

Court Official Submitting Application (Name, title, address, phone, email):

Indicate Whether Letters of Commitment from Mandated Stakeholders are Attached

1. State unit on aging: _____
2. State protection & advocacy agency and/or developmental disabilities council: _____
3. State adult protective services: _____

[Although the Grant Conditions listed above include representatives of the SSA and the VA as mandated stakeholders, letters of commitment from those agencies are not required for the grant application. Those agencies have either named or committed to name WINGS representatives.]

2. Statement of Need Questions for Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options

(20 of 100 rating points)

1. Describe the origin and composition of your state WINGS group, and the frequency with which it has met.
2. What key guardianship problems has WINGS addressed and what have been the accomplishments?
3. In particular, give a brief overview on use of less restrictive options in the state, and what efforts have promoted them.
4. Explain any existing groundwork to address supported decision-making.
5. What objectives is WINGS currently targeting?
6. What have been the primary challenges for WINGS and lessons learned?
7. What financial and staffing resources have helped to sustain WINGS?
8. How has WINGS sought to garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?

3. Project Approach Questions for Focus WINGS on Less Restrictive Options

(40 of 100 rating points)

1. Describe the support, role, and responsibilities of the court in administering the project and implementing the grant conditions set out above.
2. Describe the ongoing planning process for WINGS. What are the roles and responsibilities of the coordinator and the steering committee? Which members comprise the steering committee and how will it function in the proposed project?
3. How frequently has WINGS met, and what is the plan for future meetings?
4. What stakeholders regularly have participated in WINGS, and what, if any, additional stakeholders will be sought?
5. What workgroups has WINGS created; how often have they met, and how often do they plan to meet?
6. What have been the key accomplishments of WINGS?
7. What have been the key obstacles and lessons learned?
8. What are the anticipated key objectives for the proposed project and how will they be met? How does WINGS plan to make measurable progress beyond its current status and reinforce its efforts to date?
9. Describe how WINGS will take the inclusive approach and target disadvantaged populations as required in the grant conditions.
10. What are the primary activities you envision will drive your WINGS in the focus on less restrictive options including supported decision-making?
 - a. How will these activities be accomplished?

- b. How do these activities go above and beyond the envisioned accomplishments for existing WINGS, such that they justify the need for the extra funds?
- 11. How has WINGS engaged the public and how will it do so in the proposed project?
- 12. How have you addressed or will you address turnover in WINGS leadership?
- 13. How will WINGS continue to garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?
- 14. How will WINGS use the funding under this project to ensure or support its sustainability once the funding ends?

D. Focus WINGS on Court Oversight

1. Applicant Information

State:

Court Official Submitting Application (Name, title, address, phone, email):

Indicate Whether Letters of Commitment from Mandated Stakeholders are Attached

- 1. State unit on aging: _____
- 2. State protection & advocacy agency and/or developmental disabilities council: _____
- 3. State adult protective services: _____

[Although the Grant Conditions listed above include representatives of the SSA and the VA as mandated stakeholders, letters of commitment from those agencies are not required for the grant application. Those agencies have either named or committed to name WINGS representatives.]

2. Statement of Need Questions for Focus WINGS on Court Oversight

(20 of 100 rating points)

- 1. Describe the origin and composition of your state WINGS group, and the frequency with which it has met.
- 2. What key guardianship problems has WINGS addressed and what have been the accomplishments?
- 3. In particular, give a brief overview of existing court procedures for oversight of guardians.
- 4. Explain the gaps in oversight and the reasons for the gaps.
- 5. What have been the primary challenges for WINGS and lessons learned?
- 6. What objectives is WINGS currently targeting?
- 7. What financial and staffing resources have helped to sustain WINGS?
- 8. How has WINGS sought to garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?

3. Project Approach Questions for Focus WINGS on Court Oversight

(40 of 100 rating points)

1. Describe the support, role, and responsibilities of the court in administering the project and implementing the grant conditions set out above.
2. Describe the ongoing planning process for WINGS. What are the roles and responsibilities of the coordinator and the steering committee? Which members comprise the steering committee and how will it function in the proposed project?
3. How frequently has WINGS met, and what is the plan for future meetings?
4. What stakeholders regularly have participated in WINGS, and what, if any, additional stakeholders will be sought?
5. What workgroups has WINGS created; how often have they met, and how often do they plan to meet?
6. What have been the key accomplishments of WINGS?
7. What have been the key obstacles and lessons learned?
8. What are the anticipated key objectives for the proposed project and how will they be met? How does WINGS plan to make measurable progress beyond its current status and reinforce its efforts to date?
9. Describe how WINGS will take the inclusive approach and target disadvantaged populations as required in the grant conditions.
10. What are the primary activities you envision will drive your WINGS in the focus on court oversight?
 - a. How will these activities be accomplished?
 - b. How do these activities go above and beyond the envisioned accomplishments for existing WINGS, such that they justify the need for the extra funds?
11. How has WINGS engaged the public and how will it do so in the proposed project?
12. How have you addressed or will you address turnover in WINGS leadership?
13. How will WINGS continue to garner political/governmental leadership support and buy-in?
14. How will WINGS use the funding under this project to ensure or support its sustainability once the funding ends?

F. Budget Information and Form for All Applicants

(20 of 100 rating points)

Courts applying to establish new WINGS or enhance and expand existing WINGS may request up to \$20,000. Courts applying for a Focus WINGS grant may request up to \$30,000. The Budget Form provided below must be used; it does not count toward the seven page limit.

On the form, list the line items and budget allocations for the 12-month project period. Ensure the budget is consistent with the Approach and the Work Plan, and includes coordinator staff time.

ABA requires that all budgets be divided into the following major categories of expenditure:

1. PERSONNEL

These are costs associated with compensation of the applicant's staff such as the direct salaries, taxes, and fringe benefits.

2. TRAVEL

These are costs for project staff and stakeholders for necessary travel, such as transportation to attend meetings. NOTE: Do not include travel for project coordinator to attend the Forum in the budget as the ABA Commission WINGS project will cover that expense.

3. EQUIPMENT

Enter zero (0) or N/A as equipment costs are not allowed for this project.

4. SUPPLIES

These costs include supply items necessary for the implementation of the project which have a per-unit cost under \$5,000.

5. CONTRACTUAL

These costs include costs undertaken on a contractual basis by an outside party. Examples include: contracts with a publisher to print manuals, contracts signed with expert consultants from outside of the organization, etc.

6. OTHER DIRECT COSTS

These costs include all those not falling into one of the above categories, such as general office space rental costs, utility costs, postage, and telephone. Also included in this category are reasonable costs associated with stakeholder meetings.

7. INDIRECT COSTS

These costs include any administrative overhead costs that cannot be attributed to one particular activity or project. If you choose to include indirect costs you can use either of the following options:

Indirect Cost Rate Agreement: If the applicant has a Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) with a US government entity they must utilize this rate and attach a copy of the NICRA. If the applicant has an otherwise established indirect cost rate they can apply this rate only if the document establishing that cost rate is attached. Please note that if indirect costs are included that the same costs cannot be included as direct costs elsewhere in the budget.

Courts are not required to devote to the WINGS project additional amounts beyond what is requested from the ABA Commission. However, a commitment of additional funds could help to show support and buy-in for WINGS, and therefore could result in a higher rating.

CATEGORY	FEDERAL GRANT PROJECT FUNDS REQUESTED	JUSTIFICATION (SHOW CALCULATIONS)
PERSONNEL		
FRINGE BENEFITS		
TRAVEL		
EQUIPMENT		
SUPPLIES		
CONTRACTUAL		
OTHER		
INDIRECT CHARGES		
TOTAL		

Required Match Information. Match is required by ACL, the court must agree to track the time of participating stakeholders and other contributed in-kind or cash resources. For every three (3) dollars received in Federal funding, the applicant must contribute at least one (1) dollar in non-Federal resources toward the project’s total cost. The non-Federal resources that can be used as match include, for example, time of participating stakeholders or contributions of cash or services. The ABA Commission will provide technical assistance about and a reporting form for the match requirement.

By submitting this proposal, the applicant acknowledges that federal in-kind or cash match is required and agrees to provide match of at least: \$ _____.

If your match exceed the minimum requirement, please briefly explain the sources: _____

G. Organizational Information Form for All Applicants

To ensure that the American Bar Association (ABA) complies with federal law and regulations governing this grant project, we must obtain your answers to the following questions. Successful applicants may need to provide additional information.

1. Proposal Information

Proposed Project Amount: _____

Proposed Project Start Date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____

Proposed Project End Date (mm/dd/yyyy): _____

2. Organizational Information

Official Operating Name, DBA (doing business as): _____

Address: _____

Address Line 2: _____

City, State, & Zip Code: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

3. Funding Information

Select one (1) of the following:

We do not receive or anticipate receiving \$25M in US federal funding.

We receive \$25M or more in US federal funding but the federal funding is less than 80% of our gross revenue.

We receive or anticipate receiving more than \$25M in US federal funds and the federal funding is 80% or more of our gross revenue.

4. DUNS number: _____

All Organizations seeking subaward funding from the ABA, under a US Government prime award, are required to provide a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in the Subaward Application. If your organization does not already have a DUNS number, you must obtain one from Dun & Bradstreet by telephone (866-705-5711) or the [Internet](#). The process shouldn't take more than 20 minutes. The number could be issued immediately or within 1 to 3 business days.

5. Current ABA Funding

Is your organization currently receiving funding from the ABA, either by subaward or any other method of funding?

No, our organization is not currently receiving funding from the ABA.

___ Yes, our organization is currently receiving funding from the ABA. Provide information about the current funding below.

ABA entity providing this funding: _____

Current Project Title: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

Current Project Amount: \$ _____

Project Timeframe: _____

6. Past ABA Funding

Has your organization received funding from the ABA in the past?

___ No, our organization has never received funding from the ABA.

___ Yes, our organization has received funding from the ABA in the past. Provide information about the last three (3) most recently funded ABA projects below.

a. Project Title: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

ABA entity from which funding was received: _____

Project Amount: \$ _____

Project Timeframe: _____

b. Project Title: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

ABA entity from which funding was received: _____

Project Amount: \$ _____

Project Timeframe: _____

c. Project Title: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

ABA entity from which funding was received: _____

Project Amount: \$ _____

Project Timeframe: _____

7. Other Funding

Is your organization currently receiving funding from sources other than state government or the ABA, either by subaward or any other method of funding?

___ No, our organization is not receiving outside funding.

___ Yes, our organization is receiving outside funding from sources other than state government or the ABA. Provide information about the three (3) sources for which you receive the most funding (if applicable). *The ABA retains the right to contact the other funding sources listed below.*

a. Organization/Company Name, Address, Telephone, E-mail: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

b. Organization/Company Name, Address, Telephone, E-mail: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

c. Organization/Company Name, Address, Telephone, E-mail: _____

___ Subaward ___ Contract ___ Other Funding Method

8. Direct Federal Funding

a. Does your organization receive funds directly from the US government or any of its agencies?

___ Yes, our organization receives funds directly from the US government.

If you answered yes, please provide a copy of your negotiated indirect cost rate agreement (NICRA), as an Attachment.

___ No, our organization does not receive funds directly from the US government.

If you answered no, will you be electing to use your organization's established indirect cost rate? ___ Yes ___ No

You can apply this rate only if a copy of the document establishing that cost rate is attached, as an Attachment.

b. If you answered yes to question a. above, does your organization expend \$750,000 or more during your fiscal year in US government federal funding?

___ No, our organization does not expend \$750,000 or more in US government funding per fiscal year.

___ Yes, our organization expends \$750,000 or more in US government federal funding per fiscal year.

9. Federal Exclusion

Has your organization ever been debarred, suspended or otherwise excluded from participation in US government federal programs or activities?

___ No, our organization has never been debarred, suspended or excluded.

___ Yes, please provide details:

10. Financial Policies

Does your organization have written financial policies (financial policy manuals, accounting policies, grant administration policies and procedures, and/or other written policies governing the handling of organizational funds)?

No, our organization does not have such policies in writing.

Yes, a copy of those policies are provided as an Attachment.

III. APPENDIX A - CHART OF WINGS PROJECT RESPONSIBILITIES

OBLIGATIONS (A = Administrative, TA = Technical Assistance, E = Evaluation)	ABA	NCSC	NEW WINGS	EXISTING WINGS	FOCUS WINGS	WHEN (1 = Yr. 1, 2 = Yr. 2)
Enter into subcontracts for funding and support (A)	X		X	X	X	1
Provide and review budget reporting forms (including match) and interim and final progress reporting forms to WINGS (A)	X					1 + 2
Submit budget reporting forms (including match) and interim and final progress reporting forms to ABA (A)			X	X	X	1 + 2
Comply with Federal grant requirements (A)	X	X	X	X	X	1 + 2
Participate in group kick-off call for WINGS grantees (A)	X	X	X	X	X	1
Participate in individual kick-off call with WINGS coordinator/steering committee (A)(TA)	X	X	X	X	X	1
Create, maintain, and update a WINGS website and discussion list for information sharing (TA)	X					1 + 2
Participate in technical assistance site visits (TA)	X		X		X	1
Participate in general information-sharing/technical assistance calls every other month for WINGS Coordinators (TA)	X		X	X	X	1 + 2
Participate in special technical assistance calls (TA)	X				X	1 + 2
Provide technical assistance to <u>all</u> WINGS upon request (TA)	X	X				1 + 2

OBLIGATIONS (A = Administrative, TA = Technical Assistance, E = Evaluation)	ABA	NCSC	NEW WINGS	EXISTING WINGS	FOCUS WINGS	WHEN (1 = Yr. 1, 2 = Yr. 2)
Participate in a mandatory in-person day-long Forum for WINGS Coordinators (TA)(E)	X	X	X	X	X	2
Participate in training of WINGS coordinators on strategic planning and outcome measurement (TA)(E)		X	X	X	X	1
Provide technical assistance in planning and outcome measurement to all WINGS upon request (TA)(E)		X				1 + 2
Provide technical assistance concerning performance measures (TA)(E)		X			X	1 + 2
Participate in site visits to assist in development of performance measures (TA)(E)		X			X	2
Participate in an initial online survey of all WINGS stakeholders to evaluate WINGS activities related to this project (E)		X	X	X	X	2
Participate in a second online survey of all WINGS stakeholders to evaluate WINGS activities related to this project (E)		X	X	X	X	2
Participate in mandatory telephone interviews with WINGS coordinators to evaluate WINGS activities related to this project (E)		X	X	X	X	2