



## **PSG FY26 Post-Application Feedback Summary**

### **1. Survey at a Glance**

- 766 recipients; 63 responses (8%).
- Mix of small, mid-sized, and large organizations with the highest respondents being large organizations (52%).
- 4 out of 5 attended the pre-application workshop.
- 84% were satisfied with the information received at the pre-application workshop.
- 2/3 applied for a Public Service Grant
- 2/3 were satisfied with the overall application process.
- Most rated staff as helpful and responsive; a smaller but important group reported challenges.

### **2. What Went Well (Perceived Strengths)**

- Staff support: Staff is frequently described as accessible, professional, and solution-oriented.
- Workshop: Viewed as informative and helpful, especially for first-time applicants.
- Communication: Many appreciated timely responses and willingness to clarify questions.
- Portal changes: Several noted the online system and character limits as improvements over prior years.

### **3. Key Pain Points (Perceptions & Opportunities)**

- Awareness & access:
  - Some agencies were unaware of the workshop or learned about it late.
  - Live-only attendance was hard for some, especially smaller teams.
- Application burden:
  - Application felt lengthy and repetitive to some, particularly smaller agencies without grant staff.
  - Administrative effort was seen as high relative to award size by some respondents.
- Portal & technical issues:
  - System behavior around certain characters (e.g., %), perceived truncation of text, and login issues.
  - Confusion between "save" and "submit," and no built-in way to correct clear mistakes pre-deadline.
- Documentation & eligibility:
  - Some uncertainty about exact financial documentation required and differences between audits and other statements.
  - Disqualification for labeling or technical issues felt discouraging to some, especially when information was already on file.
- Appeals & fairness:
  - High number of appeals created stress and raised questions about clarity of expectations.
  - Some perceived inconsistency in how similar issues were treated.
- Funding priorities:
  - Some concern that shifts in priorities may make it harder for prevention-focused or smaller programs to compete.
  - Perception that larger organizations may have structural advantages in a competitive process.

### **4. Common Improvement Ideas (From Respondents)**

- Training & workshop format:
  - Offer recorded workshop + short knowledge check as an alternative to live-only attendance.
  - Offer an alternative option for experienced applicants.
  - Provide targeted training on budgets and financial documentation.
- Communication & guidance:
  - Clearer, more concise emails with key dates, links, and checklists.
  - Posted Q&A so all agencies see the same clarifications.
- Portal & process:
  - Address known technical issues (special characters, text limits, login/access).
  - Add prompts/guards around final submission and, where policy allows, limited pre-deadline corrections.
- Documentation & eligibility:
  - Simple, visual checklists by organization type and situation.
  - Clear explanation of when issues can be "cured" versus when they are disqualifying.
- Scoring transparency & policy:
  - Share basic score breakdowns and, where feasible, short comments to guide improvement.
  - Explore multi-year grants, modest post-award budget flexibility, and options that reduce repeat paperwork.

### **5. Overall Takeaways for PSG Staff**

- Most respondents view PSG staff as committed partners and value both the funding and the support.
- Concerns raised are largely about process clarity, technical issues, and workload, not about staff intent.
- Incremental changes in communication, portal design, and documentation guidance could reduce frustration.
- The feedback can be used to affirm what is working well and guide calm, thoughtful refinements going forward.