

Attachment 1: Oakland Park Grant Application Scoring Description

Scoring Procedure: The procedure was developed based on initial review of applications and incorporation of past grant reviewing experiences.

Reviewers: Three reviewers independently rated each proposal. Faustine Judd, MA, was asked to tally and score the spreadsheet used to generate the rankings and the report.

- Gary Walby, Ph.D., M.S.P.H, M.S., has over 30 years of grant experience, has reviewed grants for multiple agencies and foundations, and has written over 110 grants with a 68% funding success.
- Faustine Judd, MA, has 8 years of grant experience and has helped to develop grant proposals.
- Matthew Lake, BA, has 4 years experience with CSI and has helped to write 8 Federal grants, 6 of which were funded, and has assisted on scoring on several grant applications.

Non-Scored Rating – Located in Oakland Park

Rated as **Yes** or **No**, whether the address is specifically Oakland Park or whether it is noted that a Site/Location where services are delivered from is in Oakland Park.

Rating Category 1: Description of Organization

A strong response will include the following:

- Sufficient description to demonstrate need for the funds requested (mandatory).
- Addresses mission/vision, preferably in relation to funds requested (not needing to use terms mission/vision or to copy in verbatim).
- Discussion of past successes, projects and experience.
- Quality board of directors that appear reasonable to the purpose of the organization.
- Description is sufficient to understand depth and breadth of work of the organization.
- Demonstrates organizational capacity, longevity and sustainability.
- Note: If the application is made exclusively to meet matching fund requirements, weigh the information provided in light of having clear objectives and scope of services.

Assign: 0 to 3 points

Rating Category 2: Project Objectives

A strong response will include the following:

- Clear, demonstrable, and measurable project objectives. The objectives are linked to what will be done with Oakland Park dollars. **Key criteria.**
- How well objectives are linked with need and organizational purpose from Description of Organization section.
- Are objectives reasonable to the amount requested, considering the amount in relation to other dollars and the total budget of the organization for meeting its objectives?
- Are the financials provided, in general, sufficient that there is minimal or no concern that the organization will be able to meet its objectives. This criterion is important if the objectives are

Attachment 1: Oakland Park Grant Application Scoring Description

beyond the dollars requested or that they are to be used primarily as match dollars for Federal or other funds.

Assign: 0 to 4 points

Rating Category 3: Scope of Services

A strong response will address the following:

- Is the scope of services congruent with the project objectives?
- Is the scope of services sufficient to meet the project objectives?
- How well is the scope of services consistent with the evaluation section?
- Is the scope of services coherent with the organizational description?

Assign: 0 to 4 points

Rating Category 4: Target Population

Consider the following:

- Is the target population adequately described, in effect limiting the dollars to a specific, defined, and 'in need' population?
- Is the target population consistent with the agency description and objectives?
- How many are to be served? Sufficient to funds requested and services identified?
- What is the cost per person to be served? Lower cost per person is better but this is considered within the program described, services provided and objectives identified. Consider these criteria if the reviewer is unsure whether to rate the population.

Assign: 0 to 2 points

Rating Category 5: Evaluation

Consider the following:

- Is the evaluation described in sufficient detail that the reviewer can envision what would be reported?
- Is there any mention of how evaluation results will be reported and how often?
- Are evaluation outcomes measurable?
- Are methods of data collection and analysis provided, and are they appropriate to identified outcomes?

Assign: 0 to 4 points

Rating Category 6: Grant Management Experience in Last Two Years

The number of previous grants implies grant management capacity, organizational sustainability, and visibility in the community. Note that if the number of grants is not available, a high dollar amount for grants noted in the review of financials will substitute.

Assign Points as follows:

Attachment 1: Oakland Park Grant Application Scoring Description

- 0-2 grants or cannot tell from narrative = 0 points
- 3-5 grants = 1 point
- 6-9 grants = 2 points
- 10+ grants = 3 points

Rating Category 7: Leverage Funds

Leveraging funds include using funds to enhance a separate, possibly larger, funding source to maintain or increase resources to meet the specific needs of Oakland Park citizens. Match ratio is considered as part of this. Also considered are funds used to enhance the Oakland Park dollars for greater impact. Past years with ratings, leveraged funds appeared to have a disproportionate impact on final scores. Some organizations entered excellent projects but did not have matching/leveraged support and thus ended up with lower rankings. Organizations may not have the opportunities to

- No Leveraged or Matched Funds Indicated = 0 Points
- Any indication of match funding = 1 point

Possible total points = 21. Reviewers agreed that they could assign half or quarter points (e.g. 2.25, 2.5 or 2.75) if they are unable to decide between two whole numbers and to maximize variance.