|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Criteria** | **Score (1-5)** | **Comments** |
| **1. Organizational Capacity (20 Points)** | **Staff Qualifications and Experience** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization provide sufficient details on the qualifications and relevant experience of key staff? Are the staff's qualifications and experience appropriate for the proposed project? |  |  |
| **Leadership and Governance** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Is the organizational leadership team described clearly? Are the roles and involvement of the board and leadership team in the project adequately explained? |  |  |
| **Staffing Plan** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the project include a clear staffing plan with defined roles, responsibilities, and qualifications? Is there assurance that staff will have the necessary expertise to carry out the work? |  |  |
| **2. Past Performance and Experience**  **(15 Points)** | **Previous Project Outcomes** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization have a track record of successful project outcomes? Are the results of past projects clearly described, and do they show relevant experience? |  |  |
| **Relevant Experience** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization demonstrate sufficient experience in working with the target population or in the relevant field? How well does this experience align with the proposed project? |  |  |
| **Compliance and Reporting History** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization show a history of compliance with reporting requirements and financial management practices? Are they transparent in their financial and reporting track record? |  |  |
| **3. Financial Stability and Accountability**  **(15 Points)** | **Audited Financial Statements** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization provide recent, clean audited financial statements (typically for the last three years)? Are there any concerns about the organization's financial health? |  |  |
| **Revenue Diversity** | [ ] | [Comments] |
|  | Does the organization demonstrate financial stability through diverse funding sources? Are there concerns about financial dependence on one source? |  |  |
| **Clear Project Budget** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the project budget align with the proposed activities and goals? Is the budget detailed, realistic, and cost-effective? |  |  |
| **4. Project Design and Goals (20 Points)** | **Clarity of Goals and Objectives** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Are the project goals and objectives clearly defined and measurable? Do they align with the grant program’s priorities? |  |  |
| **Scope and Feasibility** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Is the proposed project appropriately scoped for the available funding and resources? Does the timeline align with project deliverables? Are any potential challenges identified? |  |  |
| **Innovation and Creativity** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the project present innovative or creative solutions to the identified community challenges? Is there a new approach to addressing the issue? |  |  |
| **5. Impact and Outcomes**  **(20 Points)** | **Measurable Outcomes** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Are the expected outcomes clearly defined, specific, and measurable? How will progress be tracked and reported? |  |  |
| **Impact Potential** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| What is the expected long-term impact of the project on the target population or community? How significant is the expected impact? |  |  |
| **Evaluation Plan** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Is there a clear, feasible plan for monitoring and evaluating the project’s outcomes? How will success be measured, and how will the project be adjusted if needed? |  |  |
| **6. Community Engagement and Partnerships**  **(10 Points)** | **Partnerships and Collaboration** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the project involve partnerships that enhance capacity and sustainability? Are the roles of partners well defined? |  |  |
| **Community Input** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Was the community involved in the development of the project, and will it continue to have a voice throughout the project? |  |  |
| **Sustainability** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| How will the project ensure the sustainability of partnerships and community relationships after the funding period ends? |  |  |
| **7. Equity and Inclusion**  **(10 Points)** | **Inclusivity of Project Design** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the project actively target diverse and underserved populations? Is there a focus on equity and inclusive participation in the project design? |  |  |
| **Cultural Competency** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Are the staff and project approach culturally competent? Does the project account for the unique needs of the target populations? |  |  |
| **Access and Accessibility** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| How will the project ensure equitable access for all eligible participants? Are there strategies in place to eliminate barriers to participation? |  |  |
| **8. Budget and Financial Allocation**  **(10 Points)** | **Budget Clarity and Alignment** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Is the project budget clearly detailed and aligned with the proposed activities and goals? Are there any concerns with major cost items or budget allocation? |  |  |
| **Cost Efficiency** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Are the funds requested used effectively to achieve the intended outcomes? Does the budget reflect cost-effective strategies? |  |  |
| **Matching Funds** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the applicant provide matching funds or in-kind contributions (if required)? |  |  |
| **9. HMIS & Coordinated Entry Participation**  **(5 Points)** | **HMIS Enrollment** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization commit to enrolling 100% of participants in HMIS? Does the plan to enroll participants and report data seem feasible? |  |  |
| **Coordinated Entry Integration** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Is the organization committed to accepting and sending referrals through Coordinated Entry? How will the organization manage and track referrals? |  |  |
| **Data Reporting and Outcomes** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the organization have a clear plan for using HMIS data to track, report, and measure outcomes? |  |  |
| **10. Sustainability and Future Impact**  **(5 Points)** | **Post-Grant Sustainability** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the project have a clear plan for continued support and sustainability beyond the grant period? |  |  |
| **Scalability or Replicability** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Can the project be replicated or scaled in other areas? Is there a plan for scaling or expanding the project if it proves successful? |  |  |
| **Exit Strategy** | [ ] | [Comments] |
| Does the applicant provide a clear exit strategy, ensuring continued support or transition of participants after the project ends? |  |  |
| **Total Score** | **Total Points (out of 100)** | [ ] | [Comments] |

**Scoring Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** |
| 5 - Excellent | Exceeds all expectations. The response is detailed, comprehensive, and fully aligned with the criteria. All elements of the section are addressed thoroughly, demonstrating a high level of competence and experience. The proposal is well-organized, clear, and presents innovative ideas or solutions. The applicant shows outstanding preparation and strong alignment with the goals of the grant program. |
| 4 - Good | Meets expectations with minor gaps. The response is solid and addresses most of the criteria well. While there may be small omissions or areas lacking full detail, the overall application is strong, well-organized, and clearly aligned with the program goals. The applicant demonstrates adequate experience and preparedness, but some areas could benefit from further elaboration or refinement. |
| 3 - Satisfactory | Meets basic expectations with some gaps. The response addresses the main criteria but lacks depth or clarity in some areas. Key details or required elements may be missing, or the organization’s experience or approach is somewhat generalized. The applicant demonstrates basic understanding but may need further explanation or improvement in key areas. |
| 2 - Fair | Partially meets expectations with significant gaps. The response is incomplete or vague in many areas. The applicant addresses some but not all aspects of the criteria, and the explanation is often unclear or lacks sufficient detail. While the organization may have potential, the proposal requires significant improvements to be feasible or competitive. |
| 1 - Poor | Fails to meet expectations. The response is incomplete, unclear, or does not address the key criteria. Major sections may be missing, and there is little to no demonstration of alignment with the program’s goals or objectives. The applicant does not provide sufficient information to assess their qualifications or the feasibility of the project. |

**How to Use the Scoring Scale**

* **Score 5 (Excellent)**: Award this score when the response clearly and effectively addresses all aspects of the question, demonstrating strong qualifications, a well-developed plan, and a high level of preparedness. The response should go above and beyond, showing clear evidence of success in past similar work and a strong commitment to the project’s goals.
* **Score 4 (Good)**: Award this score when the response is strong and complete but with minor areas lacking sufficient detail or clarity. The applicant may not have provided enough detail in a few areas or might not have demonstrated innovation, but the overall quality of the application meets the grant program's needs.
* **Score 3 (Satisfactory)**: Award this score when the response meets the basic requirements but is lacking in several areas. The applicant should demonstrate sufficient understanding of the project requirements, but their experience, approach, or execution plan may need further refinement or elaboration to fully convince the reviewer.
* **Score 2 (Fair)**: Award this score when the response does not meet expectations in key areas. The proposal may have incomplete sections, unclear plans, or missing details that make it difficult to evaluate fully. The applicant may need to clarify and expand on several points to make a more competitive case for funding.
* **Score 1 (Poor)**: Award this score when the response is weak or inadequate. If the proposal misses key requirements, lacks clarity, or provides insufficient information, it will be difficult for reviewers to assess its quality. This score should be reserved for responses that are largely incomplete or irrelevant to the grant's goals.

**Example Application Section Scoring:**

**1. Organizational Capacity**

**Staff Qualifications and Experience**

* **Score 5 (Excellent)**: The applicant provides detailed bios for key staff, demonstrating extensive relevant experience and qualifications for the project. Staff expertise is highly relevant to the project’s goals.
* **Score 3 (Satisfactory)**: The applicant provides some details about staff qualifications, but some roles or expertise are unclear or only partially relevant to the proposed work.
* **Score 1 (Poor)**: The staff qualifications are either not provided or are insufficient to demonstrate that the team has the necessary skills and experience to complete the project.