



Reviewer Rating Sheet CONFIDENTIAL

Applicant
Organization:

Project Title:

Total Amount
Requested:

Reviewer Name:

Review Date:

Instructions:

Please assign a numerical rating for each of the criteria below. Scores may range from 1 to 7, with 1 being the worst and 7 being the best. Each scoring criteria is weighted equally. Score descriptors and definitions are as follows:

7 Exceptional	Very strong with no weaknesses identified
6 Excellent	Very strong with a few minor weaknesses identified
5 Good	Strong with at least one moderate weakness identified
4 Satisfactory	Some strengths and several moderate weaknesses identified
3 Fair	A few strengths and at least one major weakness identified
2 Marginal	Very few strengths and a few major weaknesses identified
1 Poor	No strengths and several major weaknesses identified

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen ability to meet criteria

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens ability to meet criteria

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits ability to meet criteria

SCORING CRITERIA

STATEMENT OF NEED (5%) – Does the project address at least one of the funding priorities stated in the RFA and the Affiliate’s 2015 Community Profile? Does the project provide services to one or more of the target communities described in the Affiliate’s 2015 Community Profile?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

PROGRAM DESIGN (25%) – Do the goal and objectives described in the Project Work Plan align with the project description and activities? Is it clear what, specifically, is being done through this project? Is the project designed to meet the needs of specific communities including the cultural and societal beliefs, values, and priorities of each community? Is the project evidence-based? Is the budget appropriate and realistic? Does the budget justification explain in detail the reasoning and need for the costs associated with the project? If the proposed project includes collaboration with other organizations, are the roles of the partners appropriate, relevant and clearly defined? How likely is it that the objectives and activities will be achieved within the scope of the funded project?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

IMPACT (30%) – Will the program have a substantial positive impact on increasing the percentage of people who enter, stay in, or progress through the continuum of care? Will the program have a substantial impact on the need described in the funding priority selected? Is the impact likely to be long-term?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

ORGANIZATION CAPACITY (10%) – Does the applicant organization, Project Director and his/her team have the expertise to effectively implement all aspects of the project? Is there evidence of success in delivering services to the target population? Is the organization fiscally capable of managing the grant project, including having appropriate financial controls in place? Does the applicant organization have the equipment, resources, tools, space, etc., to implement all aspects of the project? Does the organization or staff have appropriate licenses, certifications, accreditations, etc. to deliver the proposed services? Does the organization have a plan to obtain the resources (financial, personnel, partnerships, etc.) needed to sustain the project beyond the grant term (if awarded)? Are collaborations (if proposed) likely to be sustained beyond the grant term?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

MONITORING AND EVALUATION (30%) – Is there a documented plan to measure progress against the stated project goal and objectives, and the resulting outputs and outcomes? Is there sufficient monitoring and evaluation (M&E) expertise for the project? Are there sufficient resources in place for M&E efforts?

Comments:

POINTS (1-7):

NOTES/COMMENTS

Total Points:

Average Score (Total score / 5):