

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION SCORING RUBRIC

Applicant Organization: _____ FRO Funding Round: _____ Score: _____

Service Type(s): _____ Reviewer Name: _____ Date: _____

Reviewer Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend funding	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend consideration for funding	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not recommend funding this proposal in its current form
Based on the combined elements below, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals and to support the overall objectives of Future Ready Oregon.	Most elements received a “strong” rating. Elements with a “satisfactory” rating can be easily improved. (See Feedback to Applicant) Score: 18-21	Some elements were rated “strong” but many were rated “satisfactory” indicating areas that need further development. With feedback and some technical assistance, the applicant could improve the project plan. (See Feedback to Applicant) Score: 14-17	The proposal has multiple deficiencies and is not viable. (See Feedback to Applicant) Score: 7-13

Reviewers will complete the rubric to evaluate the quality of each proposal and its alignment with Future Ready Oregon grant program goals. Reviewer recommendations to Council may be outside of the scoring ranges noted above. Applicant feedback is provided by the Reviewers for all applications that are not recommended.

Criterion	3 points – Strong	2 points – Satisfactory	1 point - Developing	Score
Service Delivery Logic Model:	Proposal inputs, activities, and outcomes are clearly aligned and logically support outcomes that achieve the goals of Future Ready Oregon.	Proposal inputs, activities, and outcomes are somewhat aligned and support outcomes that achieve the goals of Future Ready Oregon but require more detail to connect specific elements with one another.	Proposal inputs, activities, and outcomes are vague, incomplete, insufficient, or unclear with little (to no) alignment. Significant work is required to clearly define specific elements with one another.	
Priority Population Outreach, Recruitment, Retention	Proposal clearly identifies Priority Population(s) to be served. Describes specific strategies for outreach, recruitment, and retention tailored to achieve successful outcomes for Priority Population(s) and build long term, sustainable success at the program level.	Proposal identifies Priority Population(s) to be served. Describes general strategies for outreach, recruitment, and retention that require additional tailoring to achieve successful outcomes among Priority Population(s). Proposal may not clearly show a path to long-term, sustainable success at the program level.	Proposal approach for addressing Priority Population(s) goals is insufficient. Strategies for outreach, recruitment, and retention are vague and require significant adaptation to accommodate Priority Population(s).	
Project Work Plan	Narrative description clearly identifies the overall project goals and milestones that will result from this funding. Key activities are specific and feasible within the applicant’s identified timeline. Clearly stated reason for utilizing the	Narrative description identifies some project goals and milestones that will result from this funding. Key activities listed but require more specificity and/or a revision of the applicant’s identified timeline. Does not demonstrate reason for utilizing proposed	Narrative description is vague. Milestones are not clearly identified. Key activities lack specificity. Identified timeline is not included or is not feasible based on project work plan. There is no identified reason for	

Criterion	3 points – Strong	2 points – Satisfactory	1 point - Developing	Score
	proposed approach to achieve project goals.	approach to achieve project goals.	the proposed approach.	
Measurable Outcomes	The proposal clearly identifies specific outcomes and measurement strategies that can validate the project’s success and can be independently evaluated.	The proposal identifies outcomes and measurement strategies that can be independently evaluated and logically demonstrate the project’s success	The proposal outcomes and measurement strategies are weak and/or unclear and there is concern that the project’s success cannot be measured.	
Budget/Budget Narrative	The planned budget logically supports and is necessary for the service type and service delivery model. Budget can be scaled, and narrative describes impact of funding different levels that may be below the amount requested.	The planned budget might support the service type and service delivery model but require more detail and justification. The budget does not include sufficient information about how funding at a different level may impact programming/service delivery.	The planned budget does not align with goals or measure and/or does not support the service type and service delivery model and/or requires significantly more detail and justification.	
Key Personnel – Experience and Qualifications	Key personnel are identified. FTE, experience, and qualifications demonstrate high capacity for carrying out the demands of project activities and grant reporting requirements.	Key personnel are identified. FTE, experience, and qualifications demonstrate some capacity for carrying out the demands of project activities and grant requirements but additional personnel and/or technical assistance may be required to assist applicant to meet objectives.	Key personnel are not sufficient to support proposal. FTE, experience and/or qualifications do not demonstrate capacity for carrying out the demands of project activities and grant requirements or would require significant training and technical assistance for applicant to meet proposed objectives.	
Previous Experience	Detailed description of previous work and how it prepares the organization to effectively deliver services. Applicant’s experience or opportunity to build experience is clearly described with specific examples.	Description of previous work and how it prepares the organization to deliver services is provided. Applicant’s experience or opportunity to build experience is sufficiently described but lacks concrete examples or is not obviously applicable with the field of the populations.	Applicant’s has insufficient experience with comparable resources and/or program expectations. Application does not show clear, credible plan to overcome this inexperience without taking on undue risk.	

Feedback to Applicant: