

Linking Families and Communities RFP 27 Score Sheet

Applicant/Program _____

Reviewer Name: _____

Total Amount Requested _____

Date Reviewed: _____

Eligibility / Completeness Checks

- ☐ Application is complete and signed (Assurance page)
- ☐ Registration/license dates provided (issue & expiry)
- ☐ Federal Tax ID provided
- ☐ Program summary present (cover page box)

If any box is unchecked, note reasons here:

--

Section 1: Program Description (5 points)

Criteria: Counties served listed; concise bullets describe the primary function clearly and align to the proposed service.

Level	Descriptor	Point Guide
Excellent	All counties clearly listed; 1-4 precise bullets that accurately and succinctly describe the primary program function and fit the RFP scope.	4.5/5
Good	Counties listed with minor gaps/ambiguity; bullets mostly clear with small missing details.	3.5-4.4
Adequate	Counties partially listed; bullets are vague/general but indicate basic purpose.	2.5-3.4
Limited	Counties unclear/missing; bullets do not convey core function or misalign with RFP.	1.0-2.4
Not Addressed	No usable information.	0-0.9

Section 2: Operation & Need (25 points)

Criteria: Alignment to purchase description; program operations (activities/services, timelines); articulation of population needs.

Level	Descriptor	Point Guide
Excellent	Strong alignment to purchase; comprehensive operations plan (activities, services, timelines); clearly evidenced community/population needs with data or examples.	22-25
Good	Good alignment; operations described with minor gaps; needs described with limited evidence.	18-21.9
Adequate	Basic alignment; operations somewhat vague; needs stated but not substantiated.	13-17.9
Limited	Weak alignment; operations unclear; needs minimally addressed.	6-12.9
Not Addressed	Insufficient content to evaluate.	0-5.9

Linking Families and Communities RFP 27 Score Sheet

Section 3: Implementation – Quality & Efficiency (25 points)

Criteria: Plan to meet Tool O performance measures; target audience & eligibility; recruitment/engagement; capacity & limits; landscape of comparable services and collaboration; staffing plan (FTEs, cost allocation, other funding); required staff qualifications.

<u>Level</u>	<u>Descriptor</u>	<u>Point Guide</u>
Excellent	Clear, feasible plan to meet performance measures; well-defined target & eligibility; realistic outreach; transparent capacity/waitlist/duration; understanding of local providers & complementary approach; detailed staffing with precise FTE allocations, funding sources, and qualifications.	22-25
Good	Address most criteria with minor gaps (e.g., limited detail on capacity or collaboration); staffing generally clear.	18-21.9
Adequate	Hits several elements but with notable vagueness; performance plan or staffing allocations lack specificity.	13-17.9
Limited	Multiple criteria weak or missing; feasibility questionable.	6-12.9
Not Addressed	Insufficient content to evaluate.	0-5.9

Section 4: Outcomes (25 points)

Criteria: Outcomes & benchmarks (short – and long-term) with numerical targets; measurement plan; evaluation & participant feedback; named curriculum/tools/screenings (preferably evidence-based); sustainability/growth.

<u>Level</u>	<u>Descriptor</u>	<u>Point Guide</u>
Excellent	Specific numeric benchmarks tied to clear short/long-term outcomes; robust measurement & evaluation approach; participant feedback loop; appropriate curriculum/tools/screenings and implementation plan; thoughtful sustainability strategy; acknowledges non-negotiable state indicators.	22-25
Good	Solid outcomes with some quantification; measurement plan present but moderate detail; curriculum/tools named; sustainability addressed briefly.	18-21.9
Adequate	Outcomes mostly qualitative; limited metrics; basic evaluation ideas; curriculum/tools referenced but vague; minimal sustainability.	13-17.9
Limited	Outcomes unclear; little/no measurement; tools not identified; sustainability absent.	6-12.9
Not Addressed	Insufficient content to evaluate.	0-5.9

Scoring Summary

Section	Max Points	Score	Notes (brief justification)
1: Program Description	5	--	
2: Operation & Need	25	--	
3: Implementation – Quality & Efficiency	25	--	
4: Outcomes	25	--	
Subtotal	80	--	

Linking Families and Communities RFP 27 Score Sheet

Multi-Reviewer Panel sheet (average scores)

Reviewer	Section 1 (5 pts)	Section 2 (25)	Section 3 (25)	Section 4 (25)	Total
Reviewer A	--	--	--	--	--
Reviewer B	--	--	--	--	--
Reviewer C	--	--	--	--	--
Average	--	--	--	--	--