

Kansas Fights Addiction Grant Scoring Rubric

Kansas Fights Addiction Grant Scoring Rubric				
Evaluation Factor	Scoring	Scoring Rubric - Justification of Points		
Criteria	110 pt max	Weak	Average	Excellent
Applicant Organization	0	<u>N/A</u> ; scored at zero. Applicant organization (org) must provide all information.		
ORG. OVERVIEW	10	<p>0-3 points; provides insufficient detail of organizational qualifications and capacity to implement project, and/or the organization has little to no experience addressing SUD. Provides insufficient detail on how the organization aligns with CLAS standards.</p>	<p>4-6 points; provides partially completed response and/or fair justification of the organization, organization's experience and capacity to implement project. Provides a general description of how the organization aligns with CLAS standards.</p>	<p>7-10 points; provides a clear and complete response and detailed justification of the organization, organization's experience and capacity to implement project. Clearly details how the organization aligns with CLAS standards.</p>
PROJECT OVERVIEW AND NEED	40	<p>0-13 points; provides incomplete response and/or lacks detailed justification of description of project, and/or strategies do not align with selected allowable strategies. Provides insufficient detail of the population served and/or how project is science/data driven. Provides an unclear/ vague description of need for the project and lacks relevant data. Lacks a clear description of how funding will address the need in the community through proposed activities. Lacks clear description of how the proposed project is innovative in its approach. Provides insufficient detail regarding potential barriers and how the organization will mitigate them.</p>	<p>14-29 points; proposed strategies are detailed and align with allowable strategies selected. Includes a description of project with justification of how project is science and data-driven. Provides some description of population to be served. Some necessary detail lacking. Provides a general description of need with minimal relevant data. Provides a general description of how funding will address the need in the community through proposed activities. Mostly describes how the proposed project is innovative in its approach. Provides a general description of potential barriers and how the organization will mitigate them.</p>	<p>30-40 points; all selected proposed strategies are fully explained and align with strategies selected. Provides a detailed description of project with justification of how project is science/data driven. Clearly describes the population to be served including relevant demographic information and includes an estimated number to be served. Provides a clear and specific description of need for the project and includes relevant data. Provides a clear and full explanation of how funding will address the need in the community through proposed activities. Clearly describes how the proposed project is innovative in its approach. Potential barriers and how the organization will mitigate them are detailed.</p>
GOALS	20	<p>0-7 points; proposed project goals are unspecified, unrealistic, or inappropriate. Proposed activities lack clear alignment with proposed goals and outcomes. Goals will likely not effectively demonstrate progress toward intended outcomes. Proposed activities do not clearly demonstrate how goals will be achieved. Lacks detail or unclear how project will be evaluated.</p>	<p>8-15 points; proposed project goals are general, but appropriate and realistic. Proposed activities somewhat demonstrate alignment with proposed goals and outcomes. Goals adequately measure progress toward intended outcomes. Proposed activities somewhat show how goals will be achieved. Provides general overview of how the project will be evaluated.</p>	<p>16-20 points; proposed project goals are specific, appropriate and realistic. Proposed activities are directly linked to proposed goals and outcomes and demonstrate a logical progression. Goals effectively measure progress toward intended outcomes. Proposed activities demonstrate how goals will be achieved. Provides specific information regarding how the project will be evaluated.</p>

<p>PRIORITY ELEMENTS <i>(Optional section for applicant)</i></p>	<p>10</p>	<p>0-3 points; Addressing no priority elements from section H or response does not clearly describe how the priority elements are addressed. Unclear as to how priority elements are addressed or align with proposed project. <i>Other priority elements (A,C,D,&E) to be factored into other sections of the review.</i></p>	<p>4-6 points; addressing at least one priority element from section H and provides general description of how priority element is addressed and aligns with proposed project. <i>Other priority elements (A,C,D,&E) to be factored into other sections of the review.</i></p>	<p>7-10 points; addressing one or more priority elements from section H of the application and/or priority elements from section B, F, and G (listed in the beginning of the application). <i>Other priority elements (A,C,D,&E) to be factored into other sections of the review.</i></p>
<p>RESOURCES</p>	<p>20</p>	<p>0-7 points; lacks detailed justification of staff experience. Provides insufficient detail regarding partnership development and collaboration. Lacks detailed information regarding steps to ensure that duplication of efforts is avoided. Insufficient detail to describe how the organization is/will collaborate with MFA community partners. Organization is already receiving funds from MFA/KFA and/or is duplicating activities under other funding sources or community partners. Application appears to be the same as they were funded for previously with KFA.</p>	<p>8-15 points; provides a general justification of staff experience, partnership development and collaboration. Includes general information regarding steps to ensure that duplication of efforts is avoided. Lacks some necessary detail regarding collaboration with partners or MFA however criteria is somewhat addressed. If previously funded by KFA, provides a general overview to define how the proposed project is new/different from previous KFA grant.</p>	<p>16-20 points; provides a detailed description of staff experience, partnership development and collaboration. Includes specific and realistic steps to ensure that duplication of efforts is avoided and shows synergy with other work among community organizations. Clearly details how organization is/will collaborate with MFA community partners. Organization is not otherwise receiving opioid settlement funds from previous KFA grants or MFA funding. If funded by KFA previously, this application is for a new project or approach than previously funded for under KFA.</p>
<p>SUSTAINABILITY</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0-2 points; lacks specific information regarding what will be sustained, enhanced, or expanded or the project will not be sustained after the grant period ends.</p>	<p>3 points; provides a general overview of what will be sustained, enhanced, or expanded after the grant period ends.</p>	<p>4-5 points; proposed activities are very likely to be sustained and/or provides specific information regarding of what will be sustained, enhanced, or expanded after the grant period ends.</p>
<p>BUDGET</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>0-2 points; unclear and unrealistic budget that lacks justification for proposed expenditures to carry out proposed activities. Line items within budget lack itemization, necessary detail and/or are unclear. Unclear how funds will be spent to carry out proposed activities.</p>	<p>3 points; realistic, itemized budget with some justification of proposed expenses, but could use more detail and/or itemization to fully detail proposed expenses. Proposed expenditures mostly appear to align with project activities.</p>	<p>4-5 points; detailed and realistic budget with clear justification of proposed expenditures for carrying out proposed activities. Clearly describes how funds will be spent to carry out the project. Budget is fully detailed with proper itemization to describe each line item and proposed expenditure. Proposed expenditures clearly align with project activities.</p>
<p>Total – All Evaluation Points</p>	<p>110</p>			