

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

Agency Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Impact Strategy Name: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Performance Ratings For RFP Review</b>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Standard</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>0</b>	<b>No Evidence</b>

<b>Section B. Organizational excellence and continuous improvement (10 points)</b>						
<b>B.1</b>	Organization does not assess any continuous quality of work or does not have a clear, logical means for implementing results of assessment.	0	1	3	5	Organization clearly demonstrates how it assesses and implements learning, continuous quality, and improvement practices. Organization has clear, detailed methods for increasing excellence in all areas of organizational work.
<b>B.2</b>	Does not list any or appropriate assessments (only lists assessments created within the agency without any strong validity or reliability scores). Does not list any or appropriate credentials, accreditations, licensing given or items are from non-reputable sources.	0	1	3	5	Assessments, credentials, accreditations, licensing, etc. are listed clearly and sources are given for each.

**Section B. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

<b>Section C. Client Identification &amp; Engagement (25 points)</b>						
<b>C.1</b>	Fails to provide meaningful data for the target population in need (e.g. geographically, demographically, through shared obstacles).	0	1	3	5	Data provides meaningful evidence for including the population in need that the agency aims to address. Uses credible and easily accessible data to define population.
<b>C.2</b>	Does not clearly demonstrate outreach techniques used to locate clients to participate in strategy(ies).	0	1	3	5	Describes outreach techniques used including referral networks, client engagement and advertising techniques used to attract clients. Methods have demonstrated success.
<b>C.3</b>	Does not clearly articulate criteria and/or agency guidelines used for serving the population. No needs assessment is given.	0	1	3	5	Describes the criteria and/or eligibility guidelines for serving the population and provides a clear description of needs assessment process used to determine client needs.
<b>C.4</b>	Does not describe criteria or criteria is vague regarding when clients need additional services.	0	1	3	5	Criteria to determine when clients should receive services are clear and appropriate.
<b>C.5</b>	Client-centered and culturally competent perspectives are not mentioned. No examples of efforts are provided.	0	1	3	5	Includes client-centered AND culturally competent perspectives. Examples of policies, staff trainings, etc. that give staff the values, skills, knowledge, attitudes, and attributes to work effectively in cross-cultural situations are given (e.g. cultural and diversity trainings, strengths-based trainings, etc.).

**Section C. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

**Section D. Impact Strategy Overview (20 points)**

<b>D.2</b>	Overview fails to demonstrate how services and activities connect with the target population needs. Overview does not articulate development of program or program was not created using data or community input.	0	1	3	5	Overview clearly connects the target population needs with the services and activities provided. Overview clearly articulates development of program including providing relevant data and community input. Target population was engaged in creation (such as focus groups).
<b>D.3</b>	Strategy does not address missing building blocks or obstacles that prevent target population from achieving intended results.	0	1	3	5	Strategy clearly defines and describes critical missing building blocks or obstacles that prevent target population from achieving intended results and provides a clear, logical chain of connections and rationale for roadblocks preventing desired results.
<b>D.4</b>	Strategy only attends to current situation at hand for population.	0	1	3	5	Strategy addresses root causes and underlying issues of target condition to provide comprehensive understanding of the issue.
<b>D.5</b>	Does not articulate continuum (crisis, treatment, early identification, prevention) that the program is best suited to address or does not relate how program interacts with other strategies.	0	1	3	5	Clearly articulates aspect of continuum the program is best suited to address (crisis, treatment, early identification, prevention) and how this program interacts with other strategies on the continuum (e.g. is crisis and refers individuals to treatment and other prevention efforts, is prevention and refers individuals to treatment if they identify a need, etc.).

**Section D. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

**Section E. Impact Strategy Design (30 points)**

<b>E.1</b>	Strategy does not help targeted population or helps target population achieve very broad, vague results (e.g. data is collected for a general group and then estimates of impact are made from this).	0	1	3	5	Strategy clearly helps target population achieve a specific result in their condition.
<b>E.2</b>	Does not clearly describe how the services are provided.	0	1	3	5	Articulates frequency, average duration, intensity and location of services provided.
<b>E.3</b>	Fails to show that any model of practice was used in developing the proposed strategies. Research evidence is limited or unavailable.	0	1	3	5	Applicant clearly describes how research, best practices and other evidence strongly supports the proposed strategy(ies). Program is scientifically supported: numerous studies or systematic reviews have been given with strong positive results.
<b>E.4</b>	Agency does not have experience in addressing strategy, and/or design is not sufficient to achieve proposed outcome(s).	0	1	3	5	Agency has proven experience and strategy design is clearly sufficient to achieve identified outcome(s).
<b>E.5</b>	Strategy cannot be scaled to increase impact.	0	1	3	5	Strategy can be clearly scaled to increase impact and methodology for doing so is clearly stated.
<b>E.6</b>	Strategy has no methods in place to determine that clients experience better outcomes because of the program compared to those who did not participate. Methodology is circumstantial in nature and relies on many assumptions.	0	1	3	5	Strategy has clear design and data to support that participants experience better outcomes explicitly because of the program compared to those who did not participate in the program. Applicant provides credible evidence for the strategy design.

**Section E. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

**Section F. Data and Measurement Components (15 points)**

<b>F.1</b>	Measurement tool is vaguely described. Source of tool is not given or is not credible. No reliability or validity measures are given.	0	1	3	5	Measurement tool is clearly described. Source of tool is given. Reliability and validity measures are strong.
<b>F.2</b>	Little or no methodology for calculating measurements are given.	0	1	3	5	Methodology for calculating indicator measurements (including timing and frequency) are clearly described.
<b>F.3</b>	Does not articulate how outcome data will be used for anything but reporting.	0	1	3	5	Methods for using outcome data to improve program are clearly given. Internal practices exist to incorporate learning from outcome data to improve the program.

**Section F. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

<b>Section G. Collaborative Elements (20 points)</b>						
<b>G.1</b>	Agency created strategy without consideration for other efforts or how this strategy complements other work.	0	1	3	5	Agency identified local efforts and have already coordinated strategies with these efforts. Clearly articulates how strategy complements community work.
<b>G.2</b>	Strategy was developed in-house without collaboration from any outside entity.	0	1	3	5	Strategy was collaboratively developed. Includes community coalitions, experts, stakeholders with authority to make change, invested clients, etc.
<b>G.3</b>	Strategy has no formal means of continuing to engage community members in ongoing development and program implementation or does not demonstrate a diversity of stakeholders including client perspectives.	0	1	3	5	Strategy has written guidelines, formal meetings, a documented plan, etc. for formal ways to continue to engage a diverse background of community members, including clients.
<b>G.4</b>	Strategy does not leverage any existing partnerships and does not utilize any existing resources in the area.	0	1	3	5	Strategy currently leverages existing partnerships and resources in the area. Examples include using other agency resources instead of duplicating sources, collaborating with other resources that serve similar clients, etc.

**Section G. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

**Section H. Collective Impact or Systemic Change (15 points)**

<b>H.1</b>	Strategy works only internally with own organization or only utilizes direct-service partnerships. Strategy only works transactionally with partners or only purchases services.	0	1	3	5	Strategy utilizes systems-level or community-level collaborations and partnerships to help clients achieve greater outcomes. Collaborations have shared goals and performance measures.
<b>H.2</b>	While strategy may impact individuals on a substantial level, the strategy does not impact the lasting change on a population as a whole. Strategy does not work in policy or practice change, improved coordination, etc.	0	1	3	5	Strategy clearly articulates a reasonable impact of lasting change on a population because of the program. This includes change regarding policies, practices, process improvement, use of resources, improved coordination, reduced barriers, etc.
<b>H.3</b>	Strategy only works with addressing direct services in individuals or families.	0	1	3	5	Strategy goes beyond funding direct services to create change in organizations, associations, systems, services, neighborhood characteristics, personal networks, etc. that influence the population of concern.

**Section H. Subtotal:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Questions/Comments:**

### FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool

Section I. : Budgets and Request Justification (15 points)						
<b>I.1</b>	Impact strategy budget does not demonstrate that adequate financial resources are available. Funding sources are short term, not diverse, or uncertain. Narrative does not offer explanations for significant variances or how funds will be utilized.	0	1	3	5	Impact strategy budget suggests adequate financial resources. Budget narrative explains significant variances and clearly outlines how funds will be utilized.
<b>I.2</b>	Within the Funding Justification Form, does not provide a clear description for calculating cost for each unit of service for each funded activity.	0	1	3	5	Within the Funding Justification Form, clearly describes each funded activity along with a credible and well defined cost per unit of service.
<b>I.3</b>	Only is using United Way dollars to fund strategy. United Way funding is the primary source of support.	0	1	3	5	Clearly articulates diversity of funding from variety of sources.
<b>Section I. Subtotal:</b> _____						
<b>Questions/Comments:</b>						
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: flex-end; align-items: flex-start; gap: 20px;"> <div style="text-align: right;"> <p><b>Section B. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section C. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section D. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section E. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section F. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section G. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section H. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Section I. Subtotal:</b> _____</p> <p><b>Total Score (150 pts. Maximum):</b> _____</p> </div> </div>						



**FY2015-2017 Community Impact Partner Fund Scoring Tool**

**Strengths of Proposal:**

**Limitations:**