

<b>Kitsap 1/10th of 1% New Grant Proposal Scoring Sheet</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1. NARRATIVE: 30% Overall Score</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>1A. Project Description: 12% Overall Score</b>	0	40	0%	
1Ai. Project Design	0	10	0%	
1Aii. Evidence-Based, Promising, Best or Innovative Practices	0	10	0%	
1Aiii. Outreach	0	10	0%	
1Aiv. Evaluation	0	10	0%	
<b>1B. Community Needs and Benefit: 9% Overall Score</b>	0	25	0%	
1Bi. Policy Goal	0	10	0%	
1Bii. Needs Assessment and Target Population	0	10	0%	
1Biii. Community Collaboration, Integration and Collective Impact	0	5	0%	
<b>1C. Organizational Capacity: 6% Overall Score</b>	0	25	0%	
1Ci. Organizational Governance	0	5	0%	
1Cii. Organizational Finances	0	5	0%	
1Ciii. Staffing Qualifications	0	5	0%	
1Civ. Organizational Licenses and Certificates	0	5	0%	
1Cv. History of Project Management	0	5	0%	
<b>1D. Project Financial Feasibility: 3% Overall Score</b>	0	10	0%	
1Di. Budget Narrative	0	5	0%	
1Dii. Additional Resources and Sustainability	0	5	0%	
<b>2. EXPECTED IMPACT: 30% Overall Score</b>	0	30	0%	
1. CLIENT IMPACT- Considerations include, but are not limited to: empirical strength of proposed evidence-based, promising, best, or innovative practice; expected number of individuals in population of focus that program will reach and at what depth; impact on client outcomes				
2. SYSTEM IMPACT- Considerations include, but are not limited to: diversion from or reduced use of high cost services; value of community linkages, intra-agency collaboration, and/or collective impact				
<b>3. FULFILLMENT OF STRATEGIC PLAN: 40% Overall Score</b>	0	40	0%	
Considerations include, but are not limited to:				
1. Addressing policy goal(s); aspect(s) of policy goal(s) that existing efforts* do not adequately address; and policy goal(s) at different points in the continuum of care				
2. Better addressing same policy goal(s) than existing efforts* with justified additional cost or without additional cost; equally addressing same policy goal(s) as existing efforts to similar extent, but at reduced cost; or maximally using requested resources by lowering the cost per individual served while not sacrificing level or quality of service				
* As demonstrated by needs assesment				
<b>WEIGHTED</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1. NARRATIVE: 30% Overall Score</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>2. EXPECTED IMPACT: 30% Overall Score</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>3. DISCRETIONARY CONSIDERATIONS BASED ON POLICY GOALS: 40% Total Score</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0%</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0%</b>	

Kitsap 1/10th of 1% <u>Continuation</u> Grant Proposal Scoring Sheet	Points Earned	Possible Points	Score	Comments	
<b>1. NARRATIVE: 30% Overall Score</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0%</b>		
<b>1A. Project Design: 9% Overall Score</b>	0	30	0%		
1Ai. Project Design		5	0%		
1Aii. Staffing Qualifications		5	0%		
1Aiii. Organizational Licenses and Certificates		5	0%		
1Aiv. Outreach		5	0%		
1Av. Evaluation		10	0%		
<b>1B. Accomplishments to Date: 9% Overall Score</b>	0	30	0%		
1Bi. Progress to Date		10	0%		
1Bii. Integration and Collective Impact		10	0%		
1Biii. Key Accomplishments		10	0%		
<b>1C. Budget Narrative: 6% Overall Score</b>	0	20	0%		
1Ci. Past Expenditures		5	0%		
1Cii. Funding Request		5	0%		
1Ciii. Funding Modifications		5	0%		
1Civ. Subcontractors		5	0%		
<b>1D. Sustainability: 6% Overall Score</b>	0	20	0%		
1Di. Leveraged Funds		10	0%		
1Dii. Sustainability Plan		10	0%		
<b>2. IMPACT: 30% Overall Score</b>	0	30	0%		
<b>2A. PROVIDER PERFORMANCE</b>					
Considerations include, but are not limited to: experience with grantee to date and past evaluation performance					
<b>2B. EXPECTED IMPACT</b>					
1. CLIENT IMPACT- Considerations include, but are not limited to: empirical strength of proposed evidence-based, promising, best, or innovative practice; expected number of individuals in population of focus that program will reach and at what depth; impact on client outcomes					
2. SYSTEM IMPACT- Considerations include, but are not limited to: diversion from or reduced use of high cost services; value of community linkages, intra-agency collaboration, and/or collective impact					
<b>3. FULFILLMENT OF STRATEGIC PLAN: 40% Overall Score</b>	0	40	0%		
Considerations include, but are not limited to:					
1. Addressing policy goal(s); aspect(s) of policy goal(s) that existing efforts* do not adequately address; and policy goal(s) at different points in the continuum of care					
2. Better addressing same policy goal(s) than existing efforts* with justified additional cost or without additional cost; equally addressing same policy goal(s) as existing efforts to similar extent, but at reduced cost; or maximally using requested resources by lowering the cost per individual served while not sacrificing level or quality of service					
* As demonstrated by needs assesment					
	<b>WEIGHTED</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>1. NARRATIVE: 30% Overall Score</b>		0	30	0%	
<b>2. EXPECTED IMPACT: 30% Overall Score</b>		0	30	0%	
<b>3. DISCRETIONARY CONSIDERATIONS BASED ON POLICY GOALS: 40% Total Score</b>		0	40	0%	
<b>TOTAL</b>		0	100	0%	