## 2019 Public Service Application Evaluation Criteria

1. **Project Activities**

   **Were the services or activities the proposed project will provide clearly defined and described (i.e. how they will be implemented, who will implement them, the frequency and duration of services).**

   0 = No mention of activities to be provided or mentioned "activities" without specifying what they are.
   1 = Listed activities to be provided without providing descriptions of them.
   3 = Listed activities with vague descriptions and/or no reference to implementation or project goals.
   5 = Detailed description of activities, how they would be implemented AND by whom, with clear linkage to project goals.

2. **Data and Facts for the Need**

   **Evaluate the identified community need for the proposed services. How comprehensive is the description of the related need for the services proposed? Are data and facts such as current local statistics, agency statistics or other evidence provided to document and support the need?**

   0 = No mention of community needs or mentioned that there was a need but provided no evidence of need.
   1 = Provided some information that partially documented community need but no referenced statistics.
   3 = Provided some referenced statistics and a description of community need, including the needs of low-to-moderate income persons, but lacked essential components or the statistics presented did not fully support the need described.
   5 = Provided a clear and detailed description of community need, especially the needs of low-to-moderate income persons, supported by detailed and referenced current statistics.

### 3. Project Design

**Provides clear detailed information to support that project design is (a) evidence-based or (b) introduces an innovation that substantially improves the services provided.**

| - Project Design - | |
|---|---|
| (a) Evidence-Based  or | (b) Innovative |
| 0 = No mention of evidence-based practices or did not specify which evidence-based practice is being used | 0 = No evidence that proposed project is innovative or mentioned that project is "innovative" but did not specify how |
| 1 = General, vague description of evidence-based practice with no link to proposed project | 1 = Provided general, vague description of proposed project innovation |
| 3 = Good description of evidence-based practice to be used but poor link to proposed project | 3 = Good description of innovation but reviewer had to infer that it addresses needs in an improved way OR a population that has yet to be served OR a new aspect of population needs |
| 5 = Clearly tied proposed project to a well described evidence-based practice | 5 = Provided detailed description of an innovation and clearly specified how it addresses needs in an improved way OR a population that has yet to be served OR an aspect of population needs that have yet to be addressed |

### 4. Project Outputs and Outcomes

**Evaluate the outputs and outcome projections; are they reasonable for the target population, especially for those projects targeting high needs populations? Is there a strong link between the outcomes, the project goals, and the services provided?**

0 = No mention of project outcomes
1 = Project outcomes are not measurable client benefits or impacts (i.e. a change in knowledge, attitude, skills, behavior, conditions or status in the persons served)
3 = Project outcomes are measurable client benefits or impacts but are not well connected to project goals and services or are not reasonably or accurately quantified
5 = Project outcomes are measurable and appropriately quantified client benefits or impacts well connected to project goals and services

5.  **Outcome Measures and Evaluation**

    **Evaluate the effectiveness of how proposed project outcomes and performance will be measured, including the program/agency review process and use of relevant methods and tools. Are the methods and tools to be used to evaluate progress clearly described?**

    0 = No indicators provided about evaluation or measurement, including timelines and process

    1 = Indicators listed are not clearly related to outcome, OR number of indicators to be met are not specified, OR specific measurement tools and timelines are not provided for every indicator

    3 = Indicators listed are clearly related to outcome but measurement tools and timelines not provided OR are not adequately described

    5 = Listed indicators are clearly related to outcome, AND indicators listed are an adequate measure of the identified outcome, AND how outcome will be measured is clearly defined, AND an appropriate measurement timeline is identified for each indicator.

6.  **Prevention Component**

    **Project demonstrates a prevention component that will clearly prevent actions or behaviors from happening**

    0 = No mention of prevention component or explanation of prevention activities.

    1 = Vague mention of generally preventing something, but no additional specifics.

    3 = partially demonstrated that the program has adequate components and evidence the program prevents activities, but details were unclear of specific items being prevented or specific evidence of how program activities directly tie to the prevention.

    5 = Clear detailed description of prevention component that includes direct ties to program activities and evidence of how the program will prevent the action the program claims.

7.  **Collaborations**

    **Evaluate the collaboration and additional services or resources offered to project clients. Do these services help meet needs and promote increased self-sufficiency? Is there evidence of inter- and intra-agency collaboration? Are there details of any formal agreements and history of partnerships with linkages to mainstream resources?**

    0 = No information on complementary services/programs or collaboration/coordination.

    1 = Information on some complementary services/programs and collaboration/ coordination, but did not provide detail.

    3 = Partial information provided on complementary services/programs, collaboration/coordination, and gave some detail on how these services help meet needs and promote increased self-sufficiency.

    5 = Provided a clear detailed description of complementary services/programs and how they help meet needs and promote increased self-sufficiency, AND described intra-agency collaboration/coordination, AND included details on formal agreements and a history of partnerships in the community and linkages to mainstream resources

8. **Staff Qualifications**

   **Project demonstrates that they have the staff experience and proper level of staffing to carry out the project.**

   0 = No mention of staff qualifications or experience or of current level of staffing.
   1 = Vague mention of staff titles and degrees, but no additional specifics.
   3 = Partially demonstrated that the staff has adequate experience and qualifications to carry out the program, but details were unclear of specific degrees, training, or experience required for the program.
   5 = Clear detailed description of staff qualifications that includes education, experience and training of staff to be involved in the project.

9. **History of Publicly Funded Project Management**

   **Evaluate how well the agency demonstrates the ability to successfully implement and manage publically funded (federal, state, and local) projects in a timely manner, consistent with funding requirements AND the agency's experience working with similar programs (housing programs, emergency shelters, outreach, etc.) or programs with similar activities (case management, assessments, etc.).**

   0 = No mention of previous publicly funded project management experience or similar program experience.
   1 = Mentioned that agency has managed publicly funded and similar projects in the past but no evidence or further details were provided.
   3 = Partial or vague description of implementation and management of publicly funded projects and similar projects but evidence was not complete.
   5 = Provided clear and complete description of publicly funded projects AND similar projects implemented AND that they were managed with all relevant details included (e.g., timelines, funding requirements, deliverables, etc.).

10. **Program Monitoring Record**

    **Evaluate the agency's program monitoring record and whether any findings were resolved prior to submission of the application. Does the application describe a history of complete and timely performance reporting? Does the applicant have a history of losing grant funding, multiple findings for the same issue, or other serious findings?**

    0 = No information about program monitoring frequency or findings was provided OR the program had serious findings that were unresolved or that resulted in the loss of grant funds.
    1 = Indicated that program monitoring has occurred but did not specify regularity and did not provide detail or if there were any prior findings, OR the program had serious or multiple findings in the past two years.
    3 = Indicated that program monitoring and reporting has met funder expectations. All findings have been successfully resolved to satisfaction.
    5 = Demonstrated that program monitoring and reporting has met funder expectations; provided detail that the agency had no findings in recent monitoring repots.

11. **Organization Accreditation**

   **Evaluate the agency's program credentials and accreditations. Does the application describe the accreditation and credentials required in detail? Has the organization met the required standards?**

   0 = No information about organization's credentials or accreditations was provided.
   1 = Indicated that organization or program requires accreditations but did not specify the process and did not provide detail of outcomes of the process.
   3 = Indicated that the organization or program meets accreditation standards, but did not indicate the specifics of how the program met or exceeded the requirements..
   5 = Provided specific details on the accreditation process and demonstrated with specifics on how the program met or exceeded accreditation expectations.

12. **Financial Management Capacity**

   **Project has appropriate financial management capacity as indicated by audit results, internal controls, and agency budget. Organization provides details on financial reporting system and internal control procedures that meet federal guidelines. Any audit findings of the organization have been resolved prior to submission of application.**

   0 = No mention of financial internal controls, audit findings or agency budget.
   1 = Mentioned that financial management capacity exists but no evidence provided.
   3 = Partially demonstrated that financial management capacity exists; some evidence provided on internal controls or audit findings, but evidence was not complete.
   5 = Provided clear and complete evidence of financial management capacity; all internal control items and audit findings were addressed.

13. **Budget**

   **Project budget estimates and costs are reasonable and well supported or justified relative to the number of persons to be served, the services to be provided, and the target population.**

   0 = No support or justification for project budget estimates.
   1 = Budget estimates and costs are not reasonable and justified or budget forms are inconsistent or inaccurate.
   3 = Proposed budget estimates and costs appear reasonable; some justification and support for budget estimates were provided; budget forms are accurate but not thorough.
   5 = Detailed support and justification for budget estimates was provided; proposed estimates and costs are reasonable; budget forms are clear, consistent, accurate & thorough.

### 14. Funding Source Diversity

**Project leverages other federal, state, local or private resources.**

0 = Did not mention additional funding or resources that had been leveraged.
1 = Vague mention that other funding or resources had been leveraged but no clear evidence that monies or resources were secured.
3 = Partial evidence showing that additional funding or resources were secured.
5 = Evidence clearly shows that additional funding or resources were secured.