AB 109 Management of a Network of System of Services, RFP #2111-518 APPLICANT

Name: Felton Institute

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic	·	·				
model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance	40.5	40	40	20		40.0
measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	19.5	18	18	20		18.9
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	4	3	3	4	3.5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	3.5	3	3	4	3.4	
1. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
II.2. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5		6.5
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services						
delivery model? (5)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	3	3	3	3	3	
III.3 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates	21	10	24	30		20.4
capacity to deliver services. (0-25) 1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals	21	18	21	20		20.1
in the criminal justice population? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and						
other social service providers? (5)	4	3	4	4	3.8	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry	4	4	4	4	4	
services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	4	3	4	4	3.8	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of	_	_	_	_		
service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	4	5	4	4.5	
I.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	24	24	24	24		24.1
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and	<u> </u>	3	3	3	3	
continual quality improvement? (6)	5	5	5	4	4.8	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	4	4	4	5	4.3	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of	·		·			
performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated?						
(6)	4	4	4	4	4	
5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
II.6 Budget (0-10)	9.5	9	9	9.5	D	9.3
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed				3.3		
outcomes. (5)	5	4.5	4.5	5	4.8	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	
TOTAL SCORE	80.5	75.5	78.5	80		78.9
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to						
supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the						
applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score.						
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services						
vithout duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	0	0	0	0		
V. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

REVIEWER COMMENTS: Please identify any strengths and weaknesses in the application as well as any outstanding questions you may have relating to the content of the proposal that may impact your scoring.

AB 109 Management of a Network of System of Services, RFP #2111-518 APPLICANT

Name: HealthRIGHT 360

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic	·		,			
model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance						
measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	24	23	23.5	23.5		23.55
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	4	3	4	4	3.8	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	4.5	4.5	4.75	
I.2. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10		10
. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services					$\overline{}$	
delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II.3 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates						
capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	25	25	25	25		25
Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals n the criminal justice population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and		†	1	†		
other social service providers? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry	5	5	_	5	_	
ervices as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5) 5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of	5	5	5	5	5	
ervice deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	26	26	25	26		25.8
L. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and	_					
processes to support the program? (6) 2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and	6	6	6	6	6	
continual quality improvement? (6)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements						
(inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of						
performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated?						
(6)	4	4	3	4	3.8	
For what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and eport on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	5	5	5	5	5	
I.6 Budget (0-10)	9	9	9	10		9.3
The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed						
outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	4	4	4	5	4.3	
TOTAL SCORE	94	93	92.5	94.5		93.65
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to						
upplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the pplicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final						
core.						
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services						
vithout duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	0	0	0	0		
V. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
/. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

REVIEWER COMMENTS: Please identify any strengths and weaknesses in the application as well as any outstanding questions you may have relating to the content of the proposal that may impact your scoring.

AB 109 Evidence-Based Reentry Employment, RFP #2111-522

APPLICANT

Name: Goodwill

Program elements (maximum score of 100)				GROUP TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-20)	17	17	17		17
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (4)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (4)	3	3	3	3	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (4)	3	3	3	3	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (4)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
II.2. Evidence-Based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	16	14.5	17		15.9
1. To what extent does the research base confirm the effectiveness of the proposed services? (7)	5.5	5.5	6	5.7	
2. Is assessment of program implementation to fidelity clearly documented? (7)	5.5	5	6	5.5	
3. Are any adaptations to the research evidence clearly described and limited to low-risk adaptations? (6)	5	4	5	4.7	
II.3. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10		10
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.4 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-20)	19.5	19.5	20		19.7
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	3.5	3.5	4	3.7	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	4	4	4	4	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (4)	4	4	4	4	

4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective					7
reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (4)	4	4	4	4	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of					_
service deliver with the program scope of work? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-25)	22	21.5	22		21.8
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and					
processes to support the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and					
continual quality improvement? (5)	4	4	4	4	_
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements		4	4	1	
(inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (5)	4	4	4	4	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of					
performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated?					
(5)	4	3.5	4	3.8	_
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and					
report on outputs and outcome(s)? (5)	5	5	5	5	_
II.6 Budget (0-5)	4	4	4		4
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed					
outcomes. (5)	4	4	4	4	
TOTAL SCORE	88.	5 86.	5 90		88.4
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to					
supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the					
applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final					
score.					
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services					
without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)		0			
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

REVIEWER COMMENTS: Please identify any strengths and weaknesses in the application as well as any outstanding questions you may have relating to

AB 109 Evidence-Based Reentry Employment, RFP #2111-522

APPLICANT

Name: LFCD

Name: LFCD					_
Program elements (maximum score of 100)				GROUP TOTAL POINTS	
	NI/A	NI/A	N/A		
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted) II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance					
measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-20)	15	14.5	15		14.8
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	<u> </u>
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (4)	3	3	3	3	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to			_		1
determine the impact of the program? (4)	3	2.5	3	2.8	1
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (4)	2	2	2	2	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (4)	3	3	3	3	1
II.2. Evidence-Based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	9.5	9.5	9.5		9.5
II.2. Evidence-based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	9.5	3.5	9.5		9.5
1. To what extent does the research base confirm the effectiveness of the proposed services? (7)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
2. Is assessment of program implementation to fidelity clearly documented? (7)	3	3	3	3]
Are any adaptations to the research evidence clearly described and limited to low-risk					†
adaptations? (6)	3	3	3	3	<u> </u>
II.3. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed					
services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10) 1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry	4.5	2.5	4.5		3.9
Services delivery model? (5)	3	2	3	2.7	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.2	1
II.4 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates		0.5	1.5	1.2	
capacity to deliver services. (0-20)	16	16	16.5		16.1
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk				_	
individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice	3	3	3	3	}
and other social service providers? (4)	3	3.5	3.5	3.3	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (4)	3	3	3	3	1
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective					
reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (4) 5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of	3	2.5	3	2.8	-
service deliver with the program scope of work? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-25)	16	11.5	14.5		14
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and	10	11.5	14.5		144
processes to support the program? (5)	4	3	4	3.7	1
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and		2.5	2	2.0	
continual quality improvement? (5) 3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program	3	2.5	3	2.8	+
requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project					
(outcomes)? (5)	3	2	3	2.7	<u> </u>
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of					
performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (5)	2	1	1	1.3	
5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and				1.5	†
report on outputs and outcome(s)? (5)	4	3	3.5	3.5	
II.6 Budget (0-5)	3.5	3	3.5		3.3
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed					
outcomes. (5)	3.5]3	3.5	3.3	
TOTAL SCORE	64.5	57	63.5		61.6
<u>Preferential Points for Matching Resources</u> : Existing or potential resources are provided to					
supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final					
score.					
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services					
without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	0	0	0	0	1
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	+
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A]

AB 109 Evidence-Based Reentry Employment, RFP #2111-522

APPLICANT

Name: Rubicon Programs

Name: Rubicon Programs					-
Program elements (maximum score of 100)				GROUP TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic		IN/A	N/A	IN/A	
model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance					
measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-20)	19	20	20		19.7
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	1
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (4)	4	4	4	4	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to			_		
determine the impact of the program? (4)	3	4	4	3.7	+
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4]
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.2. Evidence-Based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	18.5	18.5	18.5		18.5
1. To what extent does the research base confirm the effectiveness of the proposed services? (7)	6	6	6	6	
2. Is assessment of program implementation to fidelity clearly documented? (7)	7	7	7	7	1
3. Are any adaptations to the research evidence clearly described and limited to low-risk		,	,	,	†
adaptations? (6)	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	
II.3. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed	10	10	10		10
services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10) 1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry	10	10	10		10
Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.4 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates					
capacity to deliver services. (0-20)	20	20	20		20
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	4	4	4	4	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice					†
and other social service providers? (4)	4	4	4	4	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (4)4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective	4	4	4	4	-
reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (4)	4	4	4	4	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of	_				1
service deliver with the program scope of work? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-25)	25	24	25		24.7
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and					1
continual quality improvement? (5)	5	4	5	4.7	<u> </u>
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project					
(outcomes)? (5)	5	5	5	5	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of					
performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (5)	5	5	5	5	
5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and				<u> </u>	†
report on outputs and outcome(s)? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.6 Budget (0-5)	5	5	5		0
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	5	
TOTAL SCORE	97.5	97.5	98.5	,	92.9
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to	97.3	37.3	96.5] 32.3
supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the					
applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score.					
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services					
without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	5	5	5		97.5
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A]
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1

AB 109 Family Reunification, Mentoring and Civil Legal Aid, RFP #2111-521 APPLICANT

Name: Bay Area Legal Aid (Civil Legal Services)

Name: Bay Area Legal Alu (Civil Legal Services)			1			
Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
I. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	25	25	25	25		25
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10		10
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
III. Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	23	25	24	22		23.5
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	3	5	4	2	3.5	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
IV. Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	30	29	29	29		29.25
To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and						
processes to support the program? (6) 2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and	6	6	6	6	6	
continual quality improvement? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated?		6				
(6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and	6	6	6	6	6	
report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	6 10	5	5	5 10	5.25	10
 V. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 	5	10 5	5	5	5	10
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the						
program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE	5 98	5 99	5 98	5 96	97.75	100.68
<u>Preferential Points for Matching Resources</u> : Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score.		5.0				_3 3.30
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	3	3	3	3	3%	
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	1 11//1	1 11// 1	,,, .	111/7	
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

NOTES: Please speak to any strengths and weaknesses that you identify in the application as well as any specific questions that you would like to ask the respondent surrounding the proposal.

AB 109 Family Reunification, Mentoring and Civil Legal Aid, RFP #2111-521 APPLICANT

Name: Men and Women of Purpose (Mentoring)

Name: Men and Women of Purpose (Mentoring)	l					Ì
Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
I. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	25	25	25	25		25
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	9		9.75
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
III. Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	25	25	25	22		24.25
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
IV. Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	30	30	30	24		28.5
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6)	6	6	6	4	5.5	
5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
V. Budget (0-10)	10	10	10	7	3.73	9.25
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	3	4.5	0.20
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
TOTAL SCORE	100	100	100	87	96.75	100.378125
<u>Preferential Points for Matching Resources</u> : Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score.						
10 TO MUST batbut stb Matculue reconnege inequinion man min expanse caracter or continue commercial		1			1	
• To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	5	5	5	0	4%	3.75
1	5 N/A	5 N/A	5 N/A	0 N/A	4% N/A	3./5
without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3./5
without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)				_		3./5

NOTES: Please speak to any strengths and weaknesses that you identify in the application as well as any specific questions that you would like to ask the respondent surrounding the proposal.

AB 109 Family Reunification, Mentoring and Civil Legal Aid, RFP #2111-521 APPLICANT

Name: Centerforce (Family Reunification)

Program alloments [mosimum score of 100) Response Cover Statement (Form II) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted) 8. N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	Name: Centerforce (Family Reunification)		•	_			
	Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
model and describes the measures and outputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs and short, median and long-term outputs. (923) 1. Are services and extensive quantified and clearly described? (5) 2. Are the proposed revices responsible to the target sopulation? (5) 3. Are the proposed revices responsible to the target sopulation? (5) 3. Are the proposed revices responsible to the target sopulation? (5) 3. Are the proposed revices responsible to the target sopulation? (5) 3. Are the proposed revices responsible to the target sopulation? (5) 3. Are the proposed revices responsible to the target sopulation? (5) 3. Are the specific strateges for obtaining and mantaning client engagement clearly exercised? (8) 4. A set specific strateges for obtaining and mantaning client engagement clearly exercised? (8) 5. Does the service exerciption discuss how RMF factors will be addressed? (9) 5. Does the service described to the proposed services and the overall Recently Services definery model. (0.01) 1. Owher are the other proposed services and the overall recently Services definery model. (0.01) 1. Owher are the other proposed services and the control of the proposed services and the overall Recently Services definery model. (0.01) 1. Owher are the other proposed services and the control of the proposed services (2.5) 3. Does the applicant clearly of secretarial transfer definition of the proposed services and the control of the proposed services and the control of the proposed services and	Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
An expensive and autotypis; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (Q-35) 23 25 25 25 25 25 25 25							
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? [5] 2. Are the proposed reviews responsive to the target propulation? [6] 3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? [6] 3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? [6] 4. S.		22	25	25	25		24.5
2. Are the proposed services exposed to the target population if 5							24.5
3. And the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5) 4. And operfile strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement obearly described? (5) 5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5) 6. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5) 7. Does be service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5) 8. Multi-tiotigning Collaboration Actualization between your reginatation's proposed services and the overall Recently Services delivery model. (9.1-0) 10. 0. 10. 0. 10. 0. 10. 0. 10. 10. 10.	1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
the impact of the program? [3] 4. As a specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? [5] 5. S.		5	5	5	5	5	
S. Does the service description discuss how RNN factors will be addressed? (s) 1. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Renthy Services delivery model. (10-10) 1. 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		4	5	5	5	4.75	
ILMUIS-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reservity Services delivery model. (5:10)	4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	4	5	5	5	4.75	
and the overall Reenthy Services delivery model. (0-10) 1. To what extent to the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described. (6) 2. To see the applicant theory of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4) 3. To what the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing profice by staffing profice of by staffing profice by staffing profice of tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverable	5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
delivery model? (5) 2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 3. To strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 5. S.		10	10	10	10		10
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5) 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		5	5	5	5	5	
III. Statement of Organisational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25) 1. Ones the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4) 2. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4) 2. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4) 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing profilements? (5) 3. Does to applicant indicate a bistory of local detention facility clearance? (5) 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5		5	5	5	5	5	
Lapacity to deliver services, (0-25) 1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4) 2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4) 3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 3. Does such as a successful and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by stiffing proficencies? (5) 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5			J			J	
In the criminal justice population? (4) 2 Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4) 3 Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 3 Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 3 Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		23	23	23	23		23
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4) 3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 5. S.							
other social service providers? (4) 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		5	5	5	5	5	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5) 4. What is the extent to which staff are questified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry sorvices as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5) 5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of sorganization and continual quality improvements (6) 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6		5	5	5	5	5	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5) 5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5) 7. Dees organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5) 7. Dees organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5) 8. Dees organizational eadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5) 8. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 9. Low hat extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 9. Low hat extent does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 9. Low hat extent does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 9. Low hat extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 9. Low hat extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 9. Low hat extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 9. Low hat extent and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 9. Low deliverables (but not weighted) 9. Low hat extent and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outc							
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5) 1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6) 1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6) 2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 7. We budget (0-10) 10. 10. 9. 9. 9. 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 8. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplan? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91. 94. 95. 94. 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicant stoat score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. **TOTAL SCORE** 91. 94. 95. 94. 93.5 97.47 **Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to the applicant's total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. ***TOTAL SCORE** 93. 94. 95. 4% 4%			-			-	
Service deliver with the program scope of work? (5) 1. O what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6) 2. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6) 3. How well does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 5. To what extent does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 5. To what extent does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 7. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 8. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 9. So the supplicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 9. Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. *To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts' (up to 5%) **NA** **NA		5	5	5	5	5	
N. Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30) 25 26 28 27 26.5	, , ,	F	_	_	_	_	
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6) 2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 4. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. So 6 6 5 5.5 V. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 5. So 5 5 4 4.75 2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. **TO what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) W. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/	service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
processes to support the program? (6) 2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 5. 5. 6. 6. 5.5 3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 5. 5. 6. 6. 5.5 4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) 5. 5. 5. 4. 4.75 TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplicant's formal funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. **To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) **W. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) **N/A*** N/A**** N/A**** **N/A**** N/A**** **N	· ·	25	26	28	27		26.5
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6) 3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 7. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 8. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.48 4% 98. 4% 99. 94 99. 95 94. 4.25% 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.47 97.48 4% 98. 4% 99. 94. 95% 99. 94. 93.5		c	6	6	6	6	
continual quality improvement? (6) 3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 7. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. *To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) 10. N/A 10		0	0	0	6	6	
(inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6) 5 5 6 6 6 5.5 4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	5	5	6	6	5.5	
performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6) 8. 4 4 4 4 4 4. 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 8. 6 6 6 8. 5. 5. 5 8. 8 9 9 1. The budget (p-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) 8. 5 5 5 9. 4 4.75 1. TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. 9. 1 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. 9. 1 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's final score. 9. 2 4 4 5 4 5 4.75 9. 3 5 5 5 6 6 6 6 5 5 5.5 9. 4 4.75 9. 4		5	5	6	6	5.5	
(6) 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 5 6 6 6 5 5.5 V. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 5 5 5 4 4.75 2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. * To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) W. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A							
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 10 10 9 9 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) 5 5 4 5 4 5 4.75 TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) 10 10 9 9 10 10 9 9 11 10 10 9 9 12 4 4.75 13 5 5 5 4 4 5 4.75 14 5 4.75 15 5 4 5 4.75 16 6 6 5 5 5.5 17 4 4.75 18 5 4 4.75 19 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicant's final score. 18 5 6 6 6 5 5 5.5 10 10 10 9 9 9 10 10 10 9 9 9 11 The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 18 5 5 5 4 4 5.75 19 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicant's final score will be added to the applicant's final score. 19 4 4% 5% 4% 4.25% 19 4 4.75 19 4 4.	The second secon	4	4	4	4	4	
report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6) 7. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 7. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 7. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 8. Budget (0-10) 1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 8. Budget (0-10) 9. Public total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 8. Budget (0-10) 9. Description of the sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5) 9. Budget (0-10) 9. Description outcomes. (5) 9. Budget (0-10) 9. Budget		4	4	4	4	4	
V. Budget (0-10) 1		5	6	6	5	5.5	
outcomes. (5) 2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/							
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5) TOTAL SCORE 91 94 95 94 93.5 97.47 Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/	The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed						
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. * To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/		5	5	5	4	4.75	
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/		5	5	4	5	4.75	
supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/		91	94	95	94	93.5	97.47
without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%) IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted) V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/	supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final						
V. Résumés (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A VI. Timeline (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	, , ,	4%	4%	5%	4%	4.25%	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted) N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

NOTES: Please speak to any strengths and weaknesses that you identify in the application as well as any specific questions that you would like to ask the respondent surrounding the proposal.