IOTI Grant Proposal Evaluator Score Sheet Instructions

## Instructions for Scoring Proposals:

Assign scores based on given criteria in the RFP**:** Your rating should reflect your opinion of the applicant’s ability to meet each criterion provided on the Proposal Review Score Sheet. Please do not make assumptions about missing background or project information, review only what is included.

Read for substance:Your primary focus as a reviewer is to recognize and judge a proposal based on the substance of the idea presented.

Comment on program quality:Take the time to make thoughtful comments to justify your score; comment on both strengths and weaknesses. Use specific and descriptive phrases in your comments, such as: “The applicant did a good job… “; “the applicant did not adequately describe… “; “it is unclear whether…”; “the applicant should be asked to clarify…”.

Avoid interjecting your own biases:For example, even if you do not think tutoring programs are effective, your opinion should not affect the objective appraisal of a proposal for support of tutoring initiatives.

# Please note that all comments, both verbal and written, during this process are public documents.

1. **Review the Proposal Review Score Sheet**
   * The review questions were taken directly from the proposal narrative guidelines and will help you read, evaluate, and understand the main points.
   * Each section of the score sheet corresponds to one major section of the proposal and has its own scoring rubric.
   * Questions listed in each section will help you focus on the main points.

# Rate the proposal on a numerical scale

* + Assign a score for each question on the scale provided for that section or sub-section as applicable.
  + Provide specific comments about strengths and weaknesses on the score sheet to justify your score and identify issues needing additional clarification.

# Do not write comments on the proposal itself

* + You may highlight or underline sections of the proposals, but do not write any comments as they should be included in the comments section of the score sheet.

# Score Sheet

* + You will send a copy of each completed proposal review sheet to Jeff Sheen at [jeff.sheen@usu.edu](mailto:jeff.sheen@usu.edu). You will also keep a copy of your score sheets with you and have them available for the IOTI proposal review meeting on Zoom.

# Proposal Review Groups (if we get enough applications to warrant this step we will create separate review groups, otherwise there will be one review group and one meeting)

* + Each proposal will be reviewed by a minimum of three reviewers.
  + A lead reviewer will be assigned to each proposal review group.
  + Each proposal review group will meet to determine a consensus score for the applications assigned to the group.
  + The lead reviewer will compile feedback from outlining strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

# Consensus Scoring

* + Consensus scores will be determined by the overall proposal review group.
  + Reviewers must come to a consensus on a final score to be awarded in each section of the proposal and an overall score during the final reviewer meeting.

# Final Ranking – to be done at the final reviewer meeting

* + Final ranking is based on the following:
    - Consensus review final score
    - Fiscal review by CPD staff

Proposal Score Sheet

## Reviewer Name:

## Proposal Name:

\*Please note the scoring rubric for each individual section is slightly different to account for the number of items to score and total points in that section.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Statement of Need (15 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  2= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  4= Met the requirement (answered adequately)  5= Provided an exceptional response | **Score**  **(0-5)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. Statement of need is clearly defined and supported by adequate and appropriate data/evidence. |  |  |
| 1. Rationale for proposed training is present and described in sufficient detail. |  |  |
| 1. How the proposed training will directly address the stated need is clearly articulated and makes practical sense. |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Training Goals and Objectives (15 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  1= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  2= Met the requirement (answered adequately)  3= Provided an exceptional response | **Score**  **(0-3)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. Project goals and objectives clearly relate to the training needs presented in the statement of need. |  |  |
| 1. Expected outcomes are clearly linked to the training goals and objectives and are articulated and delineated by project year for the 3-year duration of the project. |  |  |
| 1. The population(s) to be trained is clearly described and consistent with the RFP priorities and guidelines. |  |  |
| 1. The number of trainees to be reached is adequately described and reasonable in relation to the budget request. |  |  |
| 1. The geographical location of trainees is adequately described and reasonable in relation to the budget request. |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Work Plan (35 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this sub-section:  0= Did not address  4= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  8= Met the requirement (answered adequately)  10= Provided an exceptional response | **Score**  **(0-10)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. Proposal includes a comprehensive work plan that includes the components listed in the RFP (e.g., activities, persons responsible, staff time commitment, timeline). |  |  |
| 1. Work plan activities are presented in a logical sequence and clearly tied to goals/objectives. |  |  |
| Scoring Rubric for this sub-section:  0= Did not address  1= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  2= Met the requirement (answered adequately)  3= Provided an exceptional response | **Score**  **(0-3)** |  |
| 1. Proposal provides evidence of the validity of existing materials/curricula to be used/adapted, or a clear rationale for developing new materials/curricula for the project. |  |  |
| 1. Proposal provides a clear rationale for the training delivery methods. |  |  |
| 1. Proposal includes a description of innovative methods for training delivery, especially accessible digital media. |  |  |
| 1. Work plan activities describe the role of individuals with disabilities/family members and/or collaborative partners in planning, conducting and evaluating the proposed training. |  |  |
| 1. Cooperative agreements or letters of support from participating organizations are referenced in the narrative and included in appendix. |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |
| 1. **Evaluation Plan (15 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  2= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  4= Met the requirement (answered adequately)  5= Provided an exceptional response | **Score**  **(0-5)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. The evaluation plan describes both process and outcome methods and how project staff will monitor and ensure that goals, objectives, and activities described in the work plan are completed in a timely manner. |  |  |
| 1. Evaluation plan clearly describes what type of outcome data will be collected for each goal/objective in the work plan |  |  |
| 1. Evaluation plan clearly describes how process and outcome data will be collected, analyzed, and reported. |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Capability of Applicant (5 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  1= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  2= Met the requirement (answered adequately)  2.5= Provided an exceptional response | **Score**  **(0-2.5)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. Qualifications of the applicant agency are described and relevant to the proposed project (including evidence/statement of being legally incorporated and having adequate liability insurance). |  |  |
| 1. Qualifications of Project Staff (anyone in the budget by name or position) are described and relevant to the proposed project (including related education and previous experience) |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |
| 1. **Statement of Need (5 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  3= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered)  5= Met the requirement (answered adequately) | **Score**  **(0-5)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. Proposal provides a well-defined plan for sustaining and disseminating the training curricula, products and competencies developed over the course of the project. |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |
| 1. **Budget and Budget Narrative (10 Points)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  1= Did not meet the requirement (partially answered or discrepancy between funds requested and allowable expenses or scope of work proposed)  2= Met the requirement (answered adequately, no discrepancies between funds requested and allowable expenses or scope of work proposed) | **Score**  **(0-2)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. The line item budget shows the funds being requested for each of the fiscal years. |  |  |
| 1. Requested funds are directly related to the costs associated with the development and delivery of training described in the proposal narrative. |  |  |
| 1. The budget narrative adequately describes how and why the funds requested for each line item support the project’s goals, objectives and activities. |  |  |
| 1. The project budget does not contain any non-allowable expenses (listed on page 6 of the RFP) |  |  |
| 1. Overall, the project budget appears reasonable and adequate to accomplish the scope of work described in the project narrative (i.e. the amount of funds requested does not seem to be either excessive or inadequate in relation to the work plan) |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |
| 1. **Priority Guidance (RFP page 4)**   Scoring Rubric for this section:  0= Did not address  2= Addressed the Priority | **Score**  **(0-2)** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. **Priority points:** Presents a clear strategy to proactively address cultural and linguistic diversity in training plan. |  |  |
| 1. **Priority points:** Presents a plan to address the needs of underserved geographic areas. |  |  |
| 1. **Priority points:** Training plan addresses the needs of more than one agency or consumer group. |  |  |
| 1. **Priority points:** Proposal articulates how training materials, delivery, and dissemination methods meet ADA guidelines for accessibility. |  |  |
| **Total Section Points** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Proposal Score** | **Section Total** | **Comments (Strengths & Weaknesses)** |
| 1. Statement of Need |  |  |
| 1. Training Goals and Objectives |  |  |
| 1. Work Plan |  |  |
| 1. Evaluation Plan |  |  |
| 1. Capability of Applicant |  |  |
| 1. Sustainability |  |  |
| 1. Budget and Budget Narrative |  |  |
| **Sub-total of points from sections 1-7** |  |  |
| 1. Total Priority Points |  |  |
| **Total All points (sections 1-7 and priority points)** |  |  |