**Reviewer’s Name:**

**RFA Name or Number:**

**Application Number:**

**Applicant Organization Name:**

**Name of Initiative:**

**The application should include information in each section that addresses how their agency proposes to address the intent of the Request for Application (RFA).**

**SCORING DIRECTIONS**

If you believe the applicant’s response **more than satisfies** the intent of the question in that section, assign a **score of 2 (two)**.

If you believe the applicant’s response **satisfies** the intent of the question in that section, assign a **score of 1 (one)**.

If you believe the applicant’s response **does not satisfy** the intent of the question in that section, assign a **score of 0 (zero)**.

A total score of 62 (sixty-two) is possible in this review.

**REVIEWER’S’S COMMENTS**

Please be specific with your written comments. Specific, written comments/observations (positive or negative) are important to Council staff in giving feedback to applicants interested in improving grant applications in the future.

**NC Council on Developmental Disabilities’ competitive fund releases are reviewed objectively and without bias by a team of individuals, including Council members, who are knowledgeable and have experience in the concept that is being advanced by the Council.**

The Application Scoring Form is designed as a guide to help you assess the responses received to our RFA using the questions provided in this form. All applications should be scored based on the applicants' ability to clearly address how their agency will carry out the intended purpose of the RFA. The Scoring Form helps judge the quality of the applications, and to serve as a starting point for the team to make recommendation(s) for funding.

**Note: Application Review Committee members are strongly encouraged to read all applications once without assigning any scores to the application. After a second reading, review committee members normally feel much more comfortable and confident about the merits of each application and may more easily assign a score based on those merits.**

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Executive Summary** | | Written Comments | |
| Summary provides adequate and relevant information on the purpose, nature, scope and rationale for the proposed initiative. |  |  |
| Summary presents strategies that provide a framework for evidence-based, best and/or promising practices. |  |

Descriptive Summary Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 4)

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Qualifications** | | Written Comments | |
| Provides history of organization and mission statement. |  |  |
| Applicant demonstrates capacity to lead the initiative effectively. |  |
| Applicant articulates commitment to target population under this RFA. |  |
| Organizational structure of the applicant agency will support the proposed initiative. |  |

Applicant Agency Information Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 8)

Reviewer’s Initials:

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Detailed Narrative** | | Written Comments | |
| Statement of need is comprehensive. |  |  |
| Statement of need provides relevant, accurate and convincing data. |  |
| Geographic area is defined and diverse. |  |
| Statement of need identifies target population clearly. |  |
| Goals and objectives meet the SMART criteria. |  |  |

Statement of Need and Target Populations Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 10)

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Accomplishments** | | Written Comments |
| Outcome measures are realistic and appropriate.  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Outcomes reflect overall objective to create improved lived experience for individuals with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. | \_\_\_\_\_ | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Outcomes Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 4)

Reviewer’s Initials:

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Methodology:** | | Written Comments | |
| Proposed resources, including staffing are adequate and appropriate. |  |  |
| Proposed plan includes the five essential elements of collective impact (i.e., common agenda, shared measurement, mutually reinforcing activities, continuous communication, and backbone support). |  |
| Potential partners are listed. |  |

Proposed Personnel and Resources Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 6)

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sustainability** | | Written Comments | |
| Preliminary sustainability plan is comprehensive and appropriate. |  |  |
| Plan includes dissemination of materials, use of social media, blogs, presentations at conferences or webinars if applicable. |  |

Sustainability Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 4)

Reviewer’s Initials:

**PROJECT OUTLINE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitor and Evaluation Strategy**  **There is a clearly defined plan for evaluating initiative activities and outcomes, including**: | | Written Comments | |
| Shows benefit to persons with intellectual and other developmental disabilities (I/DD). |  |  |
| A description of how data will be gathered; |  |
| A description of how results will be analyzed; |  |
| Applicant makes a clear connection between the activities contained in the scope of work impacting the service system by identifying specific outcomes. |  |
| Outcomes are realistic as set out in the scope of work. (e.g. the outcomes are neither too conservative for the amount of award nor too ambitious.) |  |
| A plan for communicating the results of the initiative (i.e., sharing what is learned and success stories for individuals, organizations, and families). |  |
| The identity of individuals who are conducting or participating in the evaluation. |  |

Monitor and Evaluation Strategy Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 14)

Reviewer’s Initials:

**INITIATIVE/PROJECT WORK PLAN**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Written Comments | |
| Plan includes full description of all activities necessary to complete initiative. |  |  |
| Timelines for the described objectives and activities are reasonable (e.g., timelines are neither too conservative nor too ambitious). |  |
| There is a clear, logical relationship between the activities and outcomes. |  |

Initiative Work Plan Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 6)

**BUDGET**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Budget** | | Written Comments | |
| The submitted budget is detailed, breaking down all aspects of costs and justified by an explanation within the narrative. |  |  |
| Budget seems reasonable in relation to proposed activities and outcomes. |  |
| Total budget is sufficient to perform the activities and meet the identified outcomes as described in the scope of work. |  |

Project Budget Total Points: (Maximum Score Possible: 6)

Reviewer’s Initials:

**APPLICATION SECTION SCORING (Subtotals):**

**­**Executive Summary **(Maximum Score: 4)**

**Qualifications (Maximum Score: 8)**

Detailed Narrative **(Maximum Score: 10)**

Accomplishments **(Maximum Score: 4)**

Methodology  **(Maximum Score: 6)**

Sustainability **(Maximum Score: 4)**

Monitor and Evaluation Strategy **(Maximum Score: 14)**

Initiative/Project Work Plan **(Maximum Score: 6)**

Project Budget **(Maximum Score: 6)**

**TOTAL SCORE: (Sum of Totals)** **(Maximum Score: 62)**

(This is the total score assigned to this application by the individual Reviewer’s)

REVIEWER’S RECOMMENDATION:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ I recommend this application for full funding.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ I recommend this application for funding with the following contingencies:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ I DO NOT recommend this application for full funding.

Reviewer’s Name (Print): Reviewer’s Signature/Date: