2013 Competitive Proposal for Core-Operating Grant: Rating Rubric

Organization Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Decision: ACCEPT \_\_\_\_ DECLINE \_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | OP (25) | PU (25) | QI (25) | SU (25) | TL (100) |
| REV1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| REV2 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Included** | | **Quality** | | | | | | | | | |
| **E**  **(21-25)** | | **G**  **(14-21)** | | | **F**  **(7-13)** | | | **P/M**  **(0-6)** | |
| **Organizational Profile (25 Points)** |  | |  | |  | | |  | | |  | |
| 1. Organizational Mission (5) |  | | Notes: | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Brief History of the Organization and its Work (5) |  | |
| 1. Governance Structure (5) |  | |
| 1. Operational Structure including Staffing and Experience (5) |  | |
| 1. Diversity and Inclusion in Service Provision (5) |  | |
| **E = Excellent** if all required elements are present, understandable, and clearly indicate that the organization has strong governance and operations and commitment to diversity in governance and service provision.  **G = Good** if all required elements are included, understandable and that the organization is strong in at least 4 of the 5 required elements.  **F = Fair** if 2 or more of the required elements are absent and the organization is strong in at least two of the required elements.  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if most or all of the required elements are absent and the organization does not have any apparent strengths in organizational governance, diversity, or service provision. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | **Quality** | | | | | | | | |
| **Category** | | **Included** | | **E**  **(21-25)** | | | **G**  **(14-21)** | | | **F**  **(7-13)** | | **P/M**  **(0-6)** |
| **Proposed Use of Requested Funds (25 Points)** | |  | |  | | |  | | |  | |  |
| 1. Describe proposed use of funds – healthcare services (7) | |  | | Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Describe number of individuals who will benefit from services (6) | |  | |
| 1. Describe the population your organization serves (6) | |  | |
| 1. If received core operating support from REACH in past, describe how this grant builds on your previous work and the lessons learned (6) | |  | |
| **E= Excellent** if all required elements are present, understandable, and clearly indicates how the funds will be used to support the organization’s services, target population including number anticipated to be served. Includes strong description of lessons learned.  **G= Good** All of the required elements are included, understandable, but some minor details may be missing. Lessons learned may be weak.  **F= Fair** All of the required elements are included but are not clear or understandable OR lessons learned are missing entirely.  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if 1 or more of the required elements are missing OR the narrative that is included is not sufficient to determine how the funds will be used and the services provided and lacks information about the population served OR lessons learned. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Category** | | **Included** | | **Quality** | | | | | | | | |
| **E**  **(21-25)** | | **G**  **(14-21)** | | | **F**  **(7-13)** | | **P/M**  **(0-6)** | |
| **Quality Improvement (25 Points) How are these domains integrated into your organizational culture and operations . . .** | |  | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |
| * 1. Access to timely healthcare services (5) | |  | | Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| * 1. Population management (5) | |  | |
| * 1. Care coordination (5) | |  | |
| * 1. Planned care or pre-visit planning (5) | |  | |
| * 1. Performance reporting (5) | |  | |
| * 1. Primary Care ONLY: Indicate the % patients empaneled (+1) | |  | |
| * 1. Primary Care ONLY: Indicate the % patients empaneled who receive services from same provider (continuity) (+1) | |  | |
| * 1. Other quality domains indicated (OPTIONAL) +2 additional pts | |  | |  | | | | | | | | |
| **E = Excellent** **if all required elements are present**, understandable, and fully described, Logical consistency is evident throughout.  **G = Good** if **all required elements are present**, understandable, fully described. One or more elements are less concretely described or thought out OR indicators or metrics are not logically consistent.  **F= Fair** if 1 or 2 required elements are missing, inadequately developed or described OR if indicators or metrics are unrealistic or not meaningful or logically consistent.  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if more than 2 of the required elements are missing OR what is provided is inadequate to assess the quality improvement approach. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | **Quality** | | | | | | | | |
| **Category** | | **Included** | | **E**  **(21-25)** | | **G**  **(14-21)** | | | **F**  **(7-13)** | | **P/M**  **(0-6)** | |
| **Sustainability (25 Points)** | |  | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |
| 1. Describe how you have diversified funding (5) | |  | | Notes: | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Status of business plan (5) | |  | |
| 1. Status of strategic plan (5) | |  | |
| 1. Status of fund development plan (5) | |  | |
| 1. Leadership development plan (5) | |  | |
| 1. Other elements: succession plan, retaining key leaders, programming plan, plan to develop public-private partnership, and using evaluation to be a learning organization (**optional: add +1 for each additional**) | |  | |
| **E = Excellent** if all required elements are present, understandable, and clearly indicate that the organization has already begun implementing at least 4 of the 5 sustainability dimensions. Response indicates that the applicant has seriously considered the meaning and importance of sustainability and may have adopted a sustainability framework. Applicant concretely describes previous, current, and planned efforts to Diversify funding and has a current strategic plan, leadership development plan, business and fund development plans.  Advanced organizations will have already started creating new public-private partnerships, engage stakeholders in meaningful discussions about sustainability, and have plans to put remaining sustainability dimensions in place in the near term). Evaluation appears to be a key strategy to drive organizational and program improvement.  **G = Good** if applicant’s response includes all the required elements, is understandable and clearly indicates that the organization has begun sustainability planning --- but is not yet implementing 3 or more of the 5 sustainability dimensions. Applicant has described at least one effort to diversify funding and/or create new public-private partnerships; and evaluation is used by the organization but may not yet be driving organizational improvement efforts.  **F= Fair** if applicant’s response is missing 3 or more of the required 5 elements (dimensions) OR the response indicates that the applicant has only superficial understanding of sustainability. Applicant may propose to begin creating sustainability plans but limited efforts have been undertaken to try to diversify funding OR create new public-private partnerships; evaluation is rarely used by the organization.  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if 4 or more of the required elements are missing and what is provided indicates that the applicant has not yet considered sustainability planning. No efforts to diversify funding, update strategic plan, or develop a leadership development plan; or create new public-private partnerships have occurred; evaluation is not used in programming or organizational improvement. | | | | | | | | | | | | |