2013 Competitive Proposal for Program: Rating Rubric

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

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | OP (20) | PN (10) | PD (30) | KP (5) | EV (25) | SU (10) | TL (100) |
| REV1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| REV2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Included** | **Quality** | | | |
| **E**  **(16-20)** | **G**  **(11-15)** | **F**  **(6-10)** | **P/M**  **(0-5)** |
| **Organizational Profile (20 Points)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Organizational Mission (4) |  | Notes: | | | |
| 1. Brief History of the Organization and its Work (4) |  |
| 1. Governance Structure (4) |  |
| 1. Operational Structure including Staffing and Experience (4) |  |
| 1. Diversity and Inclusion in Governance (4) |  |
| **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 that the organization has proven experience with the target population.  **G = Good** if all required elements are included, understandable and that the organization is strong (got 4 pts) in at least 3 of the five required elements.  **F = Fair** if two or less of the required elements are absent and the organization is strong in two or fewer 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 history with the target population. | | | | | |
| **Category** | **Included** | **Quality** | | | |
| **E**  **(9-10)** | **G**  **(6-8)** | **F**  **(3-5)** | **P/M**  **(0-2)** |
| **Problem or Need (10 Points)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Problem or Need Project Addresses (2) |  | Notes: | | | |
| 1. Current gaps in services (2) |  |
| 1. How project closes the gap between need and services (2) |  |
| 1. How project aligns with REACH Theory of Change (4) |  |
| **E = Excellent** if all required elements are present, understandable, and clearly indicate that the rationale and context for the project is strong, aligns well with the REACH TOC, and that there is a clear community need.  **G = Good** if 3 of the 4 required elements are present, understandable and that the rationale and context for the project is evident and justified; and aligns well with the REACH TOC.  **F = Fair** if two or more of the required elements are missing and the project rationale is weakly justified or aligned with the REACH TOC.  **P/M = Poor or Missing**  if most or all of the required elements are absent and the problem or need is not described, justified or aligned with TOC | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Quality** | | | |
| **Category** | **Included** | **E**  **(25-30)** | **G**  **(17-24)** | **F**  **(8-15)** | **P/M**  **(0-7)** |
| **Project Description (30 Points)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Purpose** of Project (4) |  | Notes: | | | |
| 1. REACH **strategies** used (4) |  |
| 1. **Target Population** (number, demographics) (4) |  |
| 1. Planned **Project Activities and Services** (4) |  |
| 1. **Timeline** with specific dates or timeframes (4) |  |
| 1. Collaborators and Partners **and** their Roles in the Project (3) |  |
| 1. **Culturally Competent Services** (4) |  |
| 1. **Effectiveness** to Date (Rate if existing project only) (+/-1)/NA |  |
| 1. **Risks of this Project** for Org and Constituents (3) |  |
| **E= Excellent** if all required elements are present, understandable, and clearly indicate that the project is well designed, delivers needed services to a defined target population using culturally competent methods and actively implements outreach and access strategies to reach the target population. Strategy(s) proposed are aligned to the REACH TOC  **G= Good** if all but 1 of the required elements are included, understandable, and that the purpose, strategies, services and target population are strong elements of the proposed project. Strategy(s) proposed are aligned with the REACH TOC  **F= Fair** if two or more of the required elements are not included and the project appears to deliver needed services to a defined target population but lacks a well thought out plan of action (project activities and timeline). Strategy(s) proposed appear to be aligned with TOC  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if most or all of the required elements are missing and the project as described does not have any apparent strengths in purpose, use of strategies, plan of action. Does not appear – based on narrative – to be aligned with REACH TOC | | | | | |
| **Category** | **Included** | **Quality** | | | |
| **E**  **(5)** | **G**  **(3-4)** | **F**  **(1-2)** | **P/M**  **(0)** |
| **Key Personnel (5 Points)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Key Personnel who lead and carry out project (2) |  | Notes: | | | |
| 1. Key personnel experience and credentials for this project (2) |  |
| 1. Tasks/responsibilities of key personnel in organization (1) |  |
| **E = Excellent** if all required elements are present, understandable, and clearly indicate that the personnel leading the project are well-qualified in project management, experienced with the project type, services to be delivered, and target population. Tasks and responsibilities for key personnel are described.  **G = Good** if all but 1 required elements are present, understandable, and that key personnel appear to be appropriate choices to lead the project. Descriptions of credentials, experience, tasks/responsibilities of key personnel are present but inadequately described.  **F= Fair** if two of the required elements are missing and/or the key personnel may be inadequate to carry out the project given their experience with the population, services, and responsibilities.  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if all of the required elements are missing and what is provided is inadequate to assess the capacity of key personnel to lead this project. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Included** | **Quality** | | | |
| **E**  **(21-25)** | **G**  **(15-20)** | **F**  **(7-14)** | **P/M**  **(0-6)** |
| **Evaluation (25 Points)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Measures of Impact (8 points)** |  | Notes: | | | |
| * 1. REACH Impact Area stated |  |
| * 1. REACH Impact Indicator(s) stated |  |
| * 1. Sample Described with Details |  |
| * 1. Relevant metric(s) described |  |
| * 1. Baseline described (if appropriate) |  |
| * 1. Target Goal and timeframe described |  |
| 1. **Measures of Outcomes (10 points)** |  |
| * 1. REACH Outcome(s) stated |  |
| * 1. REACH Strategy(s) stated |  |
| * 1. REACH Outcome indicator(s) described |  |
| * 1. Sample Described with Details |  |
| * 1. Relevant metric(s) described |  |
| * 1. Baseline described (if appropriate) |  |
| * 1. Target Goal and timeframe described |  |
| * 1. Source of data (instruments, process, etc) |  |
| 1. **Measures of Execution (7 points)** |  |
| * 1. How measure fidelity of implementation? (1) |  |
| * 1. How measure quality of implementation (standards)? (1) |  |
| * 1. How measure pace of implementation? |  |
| * 1. How measure patient/client eligibility to participate? |  |
| * 1. How measure patient/client satisfaction and engagement? |  |
| * 1. How measure contributions of collaborators/partners? (optional) |  |
| **E = Excellent** **if all required elements are present**, understandable, and fully align with REACH theory of change indicators of impact and outcomes. Response includes baselines, measurable indicators and metrics, realistic targets, and Measures of Execution are thoughtful and concrete. Additional organizationally relevant or meaningful indicator(s) included with baselines and targets. Logical consistency is evident throughout.  **G = Good** if **all required elements are present**, understandable and logically consistent. Baseline and/or target goals for indicators are logically consistent with each other or with the indicators. Measures of Execution are less concretely described or thought out OR indicators or metrics are not logically consistent. Aligned with the REACH TOC  **F= Fair** if two required elements are missing, inadequately developed or described OR if indicators or metrics are unrealistic or not meaningful or logically consistent. Aligned with the REACH TOC.  **P/M = Poor or Missing** if most or all of the required elements are absent OR what is provided is inadequate to assess the evaluation approach. Information provided is inadequate to assess alignment to TOC | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Quality** | | | |
| **Category** | **Included** | **E**  **(9-10)** | **G**  **(6-8)** | **F**  **(3-5)** | **P/M**  **(0-2)** |
| **Sustainability (10 Points)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Describe how you have diversified funding (4) |  | Notes: | | | |
| 1. Status of business plan (1) |  |
| 1. Status of strategic plan (2) |  |
| 1. Status of fund development plan (1) |  |
| 1. Leadership development plan (2) |  |
| 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 6 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 diversity 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 6 sustainability dimensions. Applicant has described at least one effort to diversity 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 6 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 5 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. | | | | | |