<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Evaluation</th>
<th>On a scale of 1-10, please indicate how effective the bidder has been at addressing each of the following proposal components.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Key Steps:** How the project will work. Specific activities and milestones that are included in the project plan. | **Weak** 1 - 2  
Application provides little to no clarity on the key steps of the project plan. Timeline is unrealistic, unclear, or no timeline is indicated. The plan lacks detail and is hard to understand. Application is absent of specified activities and milestones.  
**Fair** 3 - 4  
Application provides limited evidence that substantiates the stated need. The proposal incorporates very limited quantitative and/or qualitative data that ties back to the need to be addressed. The application does an inadequate job at tying the need to a demonstrated gap.  
**Good** 5 - 6  
Application provides limited evidence that substantiates the stated need. The proposal incorporates limited quantitative and/or qualitative data that ties back to the need to be addressed. The application does a somewhat adequate job at tying the need to a demonstrated gap.  
**Strong** 7 - 8  
Application provides evidence that substantiates the stated need. The proposal incorporates sufficient quantitative and/or qualitative data that ties back to the need to be addressed. The application does a good job at tying the need to a demonstrated gap.  
**Exceptional** 9 - 10  
Application provides comprehensive evidence that substantiates the stated need. The proposal incorporates solid quantitative and/or qualitative data that ties back to the need to be addressed. The application does an excellent job at tying the need to a demonstrated gap. |
| **Need:** The main issue that this project is established to address. Data available to demonstrate the need. | **Weak** 1 - 2  
The application demonstrates little to no use of a tested model, evidence-based, or evidence-informed practices in the design and execution of the project.  
**Fair** 3 - 4  
The application demonstrates limited use of a tested model, evidence-based, or evidence-informed practices in the design and execution of the project.  
**Good** 5 - 6  
The application demonstrates limited use of a tested model, evidence-based, or evidence-informed practices in the design and execution of the project.  
**Strong** 7 - 8  
The application is strong in demonstrating the use of a tested model, evidence-based, or evidence-informed practices in the design and execution of the project.  
**Exceptional** 9 - 10  
The application demonstrates an outstanding approach to leveraging tested models, evidence-based, or evidence-informed practices in the design and execution of the project. |
| **Approach:** Models or evidence-based practices incorporated into the project. | **Weak** 1 - 2  
The organization's structure is disorganized, unclear, or absent.  
**Fair** 3 - 4  
The organization's structure is less formal and unclear.  
**Good** 5 - 6  
The organization's structure is more formal and clear.  
**Strong** 7 - 8  
The organization has a structure that is well organized and clear.  
**Exceptional** 9 - 10  
The organization has a structure that is clearly and consistently demonstrated. |
| **Evaluation:** Overview of the organization responsible for this project. Description of the lead entity of this partnership between more than one organization. When the Organization was established, the focus and services of the Organization, and the track record of success. | **Weak** 1 - 2  
The application does not include any formal partnerships. The size and scope of the proposal, this project will not succeed without an identified formal partnership. The Organization has very limited evidence of participation in successful supportive partnerships.  
**Fair** 3 - 4  
The application describes limited partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. While the size and scope of this project may or may not require formal partnerships, the project could benefit from collaboration. The application describes the organization as having demonstrated weak or no engagement strategies with supportive partners.  
**Good** 5 - 6  
The application describes adequate partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. While the size and scope of this project may or may not require formal partnerships, the application describes the organization as having demonstrated inconsistent engagement strategies with supportive partners.  
**Strong** 7 - 8  
The application describes strong partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. The Organization demonstrates a history of effective and successful community partnerships. The application describes the organization as having demonstrated clear engagement strategies with supportive partners.  
**Exceptional** 9 - 10  
The application describes very strong partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. The Organization demonstrates a history of highly effective and successful community partnerships. The application describes the organization as having demonstrated consistently well thought-out engagement strategies with supportive partners. |
| **Collaboration:** Formal partnerships and their role in the project. How the partnership will be managed and monitored. Supportive partners included in the project. | **Weak** 1 - 2  
The application does not include any formal partnerships. The size and scope of the proposal, this project will not succeed without an identified formal partnership. The Organization has very limited evidence of participation in successful supportive partnerships.  
**Fair** 3 - 4  
The application describes limited partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. While the size and scope of this project may or may not require formal partnerships, the project could benefit from collaboration. The application describes the organization as having demonstrated weak or no engagement strategies with supportive partners.  
**Good** 5 - 6  
The application describes adequate partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. While the size and scope of this project may or may not require formal partnerships, the application describes the organization as having demonstrated inconsistent engagement strategies with supportive partners.  
**Strong** 7 - 8  
The application describes strong partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. The Organization demonstrates a history of effective and successful community partnerships. The application describes the organization as having demonstrated clear engagement strategies with supportive partners.  
**Exceptional** 9 - 10  
The application describes very strong partnerships between the lead organization and other organizations. The Organization demonstrates a history of highly effective and successful community partnerships. The application describes the organization as having demonstrated consistently well thought-out engagement strategies with supportive partners. |
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<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Approach to racial equity both inside and outside the organization. Examples of practices in place currently.</td>
<td>The application does not address or provides very limited evidence of the Organizations approach to racial equity. No examples are provided.</td>
<td>The application provides limited evidence or clarity of the Organizations approach to racial equity. Examples provided are not tied to assurance of racial equity.</td>
<td>The application provides sufficient evidence or clarity of the Organizations approach to racial equity. Application only addresses one approach, either internal or external.</td>
<td>The application provides clear evidence of the Organization’s approach to racial equity. Application addresses their approach both internal and externally. Examples provided are relevant and have a strong linkage to addressing racial equity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Project alignment with goals and purposes identified by BOC for this fund.</td>
<td>Application provides very limited or no evidence that demonstrates alignment with the goals and intended purpose of the grant funds.</td>
<td>Application provides sufficient evidence that demonstrates alignment with the goals and intended purpose of the grant funds.</td>
<td>Application provides strong evidence that demonstrates clear alignment with the goals and intended purpose of the grant funds.</td>
<td>Application provides overwhelming evidence that demonstrates alignment with the goals and intended purpose of the grant funds. Project purpose directly addresses a documented need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Project evaluation process and specific performance goals. How the performance indicators will influence practices and/or inform decision making.</td>
<td>Application has very limited or no measurable key performance indicators and has not identified a system or process for capturing performance.</td>
<td>Application reflects limited measurable key performance indicators and has identified an impractical system or process for capturing performance.</td>
<td>Application reflects sufficient measurable key performance indicators and has identified an adequate system or process for capturing performance.</td>
<td>Application reflects meaningful and measurable key performance indicators and has identified an advanced system or process for capturing performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>FY2020 Requested amount, Project Budget, Budget Narrative</td>
<td>The budget is unrealistic and poorly aligned with the budget narrative.</td>
<td>The budget has limited detail and is not well-aligned with the budget narrative.</td>
<td>The budget is somewhat realistic and reasonably aligned with the narrative.</td>
<td>The budget is realistic, comprehensive, and clearly aligned with the narrative. Budget / financial proposal is sound, realistic, and comprehensive. The budget is carefully aligned with the narrative; Applicant's financial proposal may also reflect a diverse mix of revenue sources contributing to the overall project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall quality of the application submitted</strong></td>
<td>Poorly written application with numerous grammatical errors, typos, and mis-spelling. The application does not adequately address the components of the grant requirements. The application responses are insufficient and/or of poor quality.</td>
<td>The application is marginal in quality with many grammatical errors, typos, and mis-spelling that distracts from the content of the proposal. Application does not adequately address the components of the grant requirements. The application responses are limited and/or inconsistent in quality.</td>
<td>Sufficiently written application with some grammatical errors, typos, and mis-spelling; application adequately address the components of the grant requirements. The application responses are of average quality and relevance.</td>
<td>Well-written application. While the application had minor grammatical errors, typos, and mis-spelling, it was not a distraction from the content of the proposal. The application is strong in addressing the components of the grant requirements. The application responses are high quality, relevant and lead to a solid understanding of the proposed project.</td>
<td>Application is clear, complete and grammatically correct; Application goes above and beyond addressing all of the components of the grant requirements. The application responses are of the highest quality, highly relevant, and lead to a deeper understanding of the proposed project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>