ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Scoring Range: Type of score an assessor can assign 4= a scale of 0 to 4 or a flag statement e.g. clear or unclear depending on your determination and the particular flag

Ranking Weight: A multiplier or amount of significance assigned to that particular question. E.g. if the weight is 2 and you score a 3 then the total weighted score for that questions would be 6.

Maximum Points Possible: If you scored the highest available score (which is always 4), the result of multiplying that score by the ranking weight. For instance Ranking weight is 1.5 and you assign a 4 score so the maximum possible points is 6

Question: This refers to the question in the application to which the criteria/consideration applies.

CRITERIA			Considerations in Scoring	RANKING WEIGHT	SCORING RANGE	MAXIMUM POINTS POSSIBLE
Question	**Criteria**					
B3	**1**	Program/ project is in partnership (formal or informal) with other partners	• Partnerships can be either informal (i.e. in-kind support, sharing of information, assistance with the evaluation process, etc.) or formal (i.e. signed partnership agreements, formal collaboration, etc.). • Is the applicant agency working in partnership with other organizations to implement this program? • Have partner names been provided and roles defined? • Has the nature of the partnership been defined? • Has the funding or in-kind contribution been described?	1	4	4
B5	**2**	Program/ project follows a Collective Impact model	• To what extent does this program/project adhere to a collective impact model? • How far along is this agency in satisfying the five conditions? • Is the evidence of the five conditions being met clear and convincing? • Is there satisfactory justification for the achievement percentages?	1.5	4	6

				Flag	Duplication / No Duplication	Flag
B2	3	Geographic duplication	• Will the program be delivered in multiple geographic locations? •Are there other programs/projects in the same geographic area offering the same, or highly similar services? • If duplication exists, is that duplication necessary to fill a gap in service? • The answer will allow UWEO to ensure that resources are invested efficiently and effectively.	Flag	Duplication / No Duplication	Flag
						10
C1 C2	4	Greatest Need, Greatest Impact	• Does the description go beyond the strategic priority description to explain the **specific need** being addressed? • Is there a clear description of who the specific target population is and how they would be **impacted** by the program? • Is there a causal link between the described impact and the need? • Is the impact realistic considering the scope of the project?	2	4	8
C3, B2	5	Vulnerable populations (includes considerations for geographic, priority communities, equity deserving groups, etc.)	• Does the program/project serve vulnerable populations? • Is the program/ project targeting a geographic area/neighbourhood that has large populations of individuals from vulnerable populations? • Are vulnerable populations a primary focus of the program/project? • Does the program/project serve equity seeking/equity deserving groups?	2	4	8
A4, B4	6	Program/ project and Activities Description	• Is the goal of the program/project clearly stated? • Is there a clear link between the stated activities and the ultimate goal? • Is the 'what, who, when, where and how' explained? • Will the activities presented result in the achievement of the stated results? • Are the activities reasonable? Are there unrealistic expectations?	2	4	8

						24
C2	7	Strength of alignment against strategic priority/focus area (per Appendix)	• Please refer to the definition for the strategic priority in question. • Evaluate the evidence provided to clearly show that the program/project supports and will help to achieve the strategic priority.	4.5	4	18
C4	8	Social Enterprise	**If applicable:** • Does the description adequately outline how this program is a social enterprise? •Does the description adequately explain how this program leads to employment that adheres to Ontario Labour Standards? •If the strategic priority is related to employment the enterprise must also increase participant's opportunities to succeed in East Ontario's labour market, ensure dignity of choice, and foster an inclusive workplace and/or community • If the participants are not being paid at least minimum wage, do piecework formulas result in an equivalent to minimum wage or greater?	.5	4	2
						20
D2	9	Track record in successfully delivering programs/services supported by specific results	• How successful is the agency at delivering other programs/projects that it runs? • Does the agency have a history of successful/unsuccessful programs? • Are the programs similar (e.g. scope, scale, method, issue being addressed) to what is being proposed? • Are the results provided specific and demonstrative of real/significant impact? Examples of specificity would include: providing the actual percentage change in program outcomes, citing the number and extent that people were impacted, citing specific policy or systemic changes that are attributable to the program etc...	2	4	8

D3, D4	10	Ability/ capacity to deliver proposed program /project	• Does the agency, including management and staff, have the ability and capacity (i.e. experience implementing/managing similar program/projects, etc) to deliver the proposed program? • Is the agency representative of the equity seeking/equity deserving communities that they serve?	2	4	8
D1	11	Program/project aligns with core mission of the applicant agency	• Is the program/project consistent with the core mission of the applicant agency •Is there evidence of mission-drift?	Flag	Aligned / Not Aligned	Flag
D5	12	Coalition membership and individual roles and structure are clear	• Does Agency provide names of coalition members, indicate lead agency and describe roles of the respective members? • Does the description provide clarity regarding what members bring to the coalition?	Flag	Clear/ Unclear	Flag
						16
E 2	13	Activities and results relationship is backed by evidence-based/evidence-informed research	• Is the relationship between the proposed activities and the anticipated results evidence-informed? • How well is the relationship articulated? • Evidence can take the form of internal research or external research. • Is the evidence presented relevant?	1	4	4
S e ct io n E	14	Targets and Indicators, which provide evidence on achievement of planned results, are strong	• Is the agency able to report on most or all of the common indicators selected as a priority for this goal? • If the agency is not reporting on common indicators is the explanation satisfactory and provide assurances that this agency can still provide strong results that are aligned with the desired outcomes of the goal? Have they provided at least one or two strong alternative outcome indicators (is anyone better off)? • Are the targets selected ambitious enough to be a solid investment, yet achievable given the staffing and financial resources? • If custom indicators are developed will they tell us how much was done, how well it was done or if anyone is better	4	4	16

			off? Are they SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound)? Do custom indicators proposed align with what United Way is trying to achieve with the selected strategic priority?			
						20
F	15	Program/project has diverse funding sources (financial and in-kind)	• What proportion of the program/project budget is being requested from United Way East Ontario? • Is there a heavy reliance on United Way East Ontario (or any other single funder) to run the program? • Is the program sustainable?	0.5	4	2
F	16	Expenses are comprehensive and realistic	• Does the proposal include all expenses related to the program/project? • Are there any major expenditures that *should* be listed, but are not? •Are the expenses realistic? *i.e.* Are they true reflections of the cost associated with each line item? • Are budget notes present and sufficiently detailed? • Are in-kind costs included?	1	4	4
F	17	Cost Efficiency	• Are the costs reasonable given the individuals being assisted? • Are costs reasonable given the depth and resources needed for the intervention? • Are the costs reasonable given the numbers of clients being assisted? • Please keep in mind that geographic area, types of clients, types of services provided can all have an impact on cost efficiency (i.e. similar programs offered in different geographic areas can have widely different costs depending on volunteer engagement, availability of other neighbourhood supports, etc)	1	4	4
						10
					Total	**100**

PROPOSAL SCORING RUBRIC

- Each criteria in the scoring is tool is on a four point scale (however the weighting of each criteria is different). The scoring rubric has been developed to make the scoring process as objective as much as possible.
- The scoring rubric is to ensure that all assessors have the same understanding of the scoring (i.e. what consists a score of "1" and what consists a score of "4")

Instructions:
- When completing an assessment of a proposal, assessors are to refer to the Scoring Rubric when assigning a score.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">**Scoring Rubric**</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>**0 (No Evidence Presented)**</td>
<td>**1 (Poor Evidence Presented)**</td>
<td>**2 (Fair Evidence Presented)**</td>
<td>**3 (Strong Evidence Presented)**</td>
<td>**4 (Excellent Evidence Presented)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question is not answered, or no information provided in the response addresses the question.</td>
<td>The content lacks meaningful detail and/or demonstrates a lack of preparation. The content reflects a lack of understanding of the elements needed for the program/project to achieve results that will contribute to achieving the priority goal.</td>
<td>The content lacks some meaningful detail and requires important additional information in order to be reasonably comprehensive OR the response suggests the criteria was not fully understood. The content reflects a partial understanding of the elements needed for the program/project to achieve results that will contribute to achieving the priority goal.</td>
<td>The content addresses the criteria in a reasonably comprehensive manner, with significantly detailed and mostly accurate information. The content reflects a solid understanding of the elements needed for the program/project to achieve results that will contribute to achieving the priority goal but may require additional specificity, support or elaboration.</td>
<td>The content addresses the criteria with specific, appropriately detailed and accurate information. The content reflects a thorough understanding of the elements needed for the program/project to achieve results that will contribute to achieving the priority goal.</td>
</tr>
</table>