

COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT FUND FY11 SCORING MATRIX

APPLICANT:

REVIEWER CODE:

QUESTIONS: Call Tiffy Barnett at contact number provided in your packet.

Comments are required if you award less than half points possible, in a given section.

Item	Total Points Possible	Applicant Points Earned	Comments
<p>1. Executive Summary – Not Scored – 0 pts.</p> <p>2. Capacity of the applicant and relevant organizational experience (10 points)</p> <p>Assessment: 0 Points if there is no Capacity section 0 Points if the organization does not provide services to residents of Davidson County How long has the organization been providing services in Davidson County? How long has the organization been serving the population for the proposed program? Is the mission clearly stated and related to the proposed program? Has the organization received any honors or distinctions, especially related to the program being proposed? Any special accomplishments or achievements? Are key staff mentioned? Is their role in this program (briefly) described?</p>	10		
<p>3. Problem & Target Population (15 points)</p> <p>Assessment: 0 Points if there is no Problem & Target Population section. Is the target population clearly defined, including any relevant geographic indicators? Is it clear how the applicant will verify Davidson County residency? Is the target population's need clearly defined, using quantifiable measures whose source is identified? Is there a "who-what-where-when-how-why" for the problem included? What kinds of data are cited to describe the population and the need? Does the problem as presented align clearly with the Service Description of the priority area? For Community Services: Convincing documentation that beneficiaries are economically needy.</p>	15		

Item	Total Points Possible	Applicant Points Earned	Comments
<p>4. Service Gaps (15 points)</p> <p>Assessment: 0 Points if no response for Service Gaps. Does the applicant clearly describe what services are available to the target population and who provides them? Is there a clear case for a gap in service that relates to the priority area service description? If there is a Metro department providing service to the population, (a) is the proposed service differentiated from the Metro service and (b) Is evidence presented that the applicant coordinates with the Metro department?</p>	15		
<p>5. Program Design (25 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes Assessment Are program outcomes clearly stated and measurable? Do the outcomes clearly represent changes in the knowledge, behavior, or circumstances/conditions of the beneficiaries? Is the planned measurement process described and does it sound feasible? Is the measure selected a convincing measure of the outcome desired? • Services and/or Activities Assessment Are specific services/activities clearly described? Is there a logical relationship between the need/problem identified, the services/activities, and the outcomes defined? What evidence (if any) is cited to support that relationship? • Relationship to Service Description Assessment Do activities and outcomes directly relate to the Service Description for the priority area? For Afterschool Programs that Promote Success: Does the application describe how the program's Health, Safety & Environment; Relationships; Programming & Activities; Staffing & Professional Development; and Administration reflect the Afterschool Program Design Factors? 	25		

Item	Total Points Possible	Applicant Points Earned	Comments
<p>6. Collaboration and Leveraging of community resources (10 points):</p> <p>Assessment: 0 Points if there is no “Collaboration and Leveraging” section Does the application display awareness of other local organizations serving this population or addressing this same need? Does the organization have existing collaborations with other organizations related to the need? Does the proposed program build on existing collaborations? Will the organization be collaborating with other organizations/ Metro agencies on the proposed program? Where collaborations are claimed, is it clear what role each partner has?</p>	10		
<p>7. Sustainability (10 points)</p> <p>Assessment: 0 Points if there is no “Sustainability” section. To what extent does the organization already provide related services to this population? Does the organization provide other services to this population with revenue from other sources (thus demonstrating the ability to generate support and resources for similar programs)? Does the organization identify specific potential future revenue sources (e.g., a specific Federal, State, Foundation or Corporate grant program or a specific funding strategy such as a fundraising event or use of volunteers to provide services) it intends to pursue to support this program, or does it describe continuation plans only vaguely (e.g., “Will look for other funding” or “Will apply for other grants”)?</p>	10		

Item	Total Points Possible	Applicant Points Earned	Comments
<p>Spending Plan (15 points)</p> <p>Assessment: 0 Points if either the Spending Plan or the Spending Plan Narrative absent.</p> <p>Spending Plan: Do the figures add up? Does the Plan include costs for everything included in the Program Narrative? Are there items in the Spending Plan which are not mentioned in the Program Narrative? Do the costs seem realistic, given the scale of the program (e.g., the proposed number of clients served or units of service delivered)? What is the role of non-Metro funding in the program? How much “bang for the buck” does the program appear to be proposing from the investment of Metro funds? That is, do the outcomes proposed seem to be worth the dollars to be invested?</p> <p>Spending Plan Narrative: Is it consistent with the Spending Plan itself? Does it provide an explanation for how costs were arrived at? Does it justify the necessity for the inclusion of all the items in the Spending Plan?</p>	15		
	100		