Scoring Criteria

Scoring will be on a scale of 1 to 5 with a maximum total score of 25. Each criterion is weighted equally.

	Proposal Evaluation	Incomplete	Insufficient	Adequate	Good	Excellent
		1 Point	2 Points	3 Points	4 Points	5 Points
1	**Need for the Project**: Project meets an essential community need and fits with the County's strategic plan focus areas	Little to no info regarding the importance of the project to the community at large, or does not align with the County's focus areas.	Presents limited info about the need and/or has week alignment to focus areas.	Presents basic info demonstrating community need and alignment to focus areas.	Presents qualitative and/or quantitative justification for levels of community need, and aligns to one or more focus area.	Presents significant need with a compelling argument and multiple qualitative or quantitative data points that strongly align with County's strategic plan focus areas.
2	**Project Plan**: Project includes clear, reasonable actions that are likely to meet the need	Project explanation is unclear and lacks mention of a specific goal, how the project will work, or who will be served.	Project is not thoroughly or clearly explained or is missing key information about implementation.	Project structure is clear and is aligned to the goals of the grant funds but may be missing details about models, activities, and/or milestones.	Project structure is clear, including model and implementation plans, and is aligned to the goals of the grant funds.	Project is very well designed with specific activities and milestones, based on proven model(s), includes implementation steps, and is well aligned with the goals of the grant funds.
3	**Proposed Results**: Project includes quantifiable results and plan for measuring success	Little to no description of results or ways to measure performance of the project.	Description of what will be achieved by the project is unclear and/or lacks explanation about performance measurement. (If applicable, poor previous results track record.)	Proposed results are adequately described, aligned to the goals of the grant and project plan, but more information is needed about performance measurement. (If applicable, adequate previous results track record.)	Proposed results are well described, aligned to the goals of the grant and project plan, and there is a clear plan for measuring success. (If applicable, good previous results track record.)	Proposed results are clearly described and likely to have a high impact in alignment with goals of the grant funds, including specific measures and methods for effectively measuring results of the funded project. (If applicable, excellent previous results track record.)
4	**Capacity:** Ability to complete the project as described	Organization does not appear to have the structure, capability, or partnerships needed to complete the project.	Organization has not sufficiently demonstrated the structure, capability, or partnerships needed to complete the project.	Proposed project scope and scale appears to be reasonably within organizational capacity to carry out.	Organization demonstrates the structure, capability, and/or partnerships needed to complete the project.	Organization strongly demonstrates the structure, capability, and/or partnerships needed to complete the project.
5	**Budget:** Includes a clear, reasonable, and efficient budget matched to proposed project	Project budget is incomplete, unrealistic, and/or poorly aligned with the budget narrative.	Budget lacks sufficient detail, is unclear, or includes items that do not seem reasonable.	Budget is complete, clear, realistic, and reasonably aligned with the narrative and project plan, but there are questions on some items.	Budget is form is complete with explanatory notes, clear, reasonable and matched to the community need and project plan.	Budget is complete with explanatory notes, clear, detailed, realistic, comprehensive, efficient and clearly aligned with the narrative and project plan.

DRAFT