

Areas for Improvement

Expanding Access to CACs

Maximum points: 100

Common criteria to be used to describe sections which are found to be deficient.

**Goals and objectives of the grant category from the RFP:**

*To develop a CAC or expand the provision of services to unserved and underserved areas that will enable them to take the next developmental step in the CAC model. Eligible uses of the funding include any of the following: • Develop tele-mental health services • Develop tele-forensic interviewing services • Develop tele-health services • Establish an NCA Satellite member center to expand access in a previously unserved or underserved community*

*The applicant may utilize the award funds for needed staffing, equipment, software, training, and development of policies and procedures, to assure the provision of the above tele-services. An applicant’s plan must be coordinated and in compliance with the Chapter growth and development plan. For additional information on the requirements of the growth and development plans, please review the Chapter Standards and discuss your application with your state chapter.*

The following is standardized language to be used as much as possible to describe any deficient areas. For any section that receives less than maximum points, please select a general reason from the ones below. Please include additional detailed notes if necessary. This information will provide a basis for the panel discussion. These areas may also serve as decline reasons if jointly determined by the members of the panel.

1. The description of the **current CAC response** in your community and the need to develop/expand the said response to include Tele-services/Satellite location **(20 points):**

1A was omitted from the **needs statement**

***1AA -*** *0 points, the needs statement was not present in the available field/ the stated*  *need was out of the scope of the grant type*

1B did not supply sufficient, well-articulated information

***1BA*** *- 1-5 points, the need was implied somewhere else in the application but not*  *clearly, did not supply data in a narrative or attachment form to support the needs*  *statement; the provided data did not support the statement that there is an acute*  *need*

***1BB*** *- 6-15 points, the applicant did not make a compelling needs statement or*  *as*  *compelling as other applicants*

***1BC*** *- 16-19 points, it is clear that there is real need that is within the scope of*  *the grant,*  *however, the statement itself could have been written/articulated*  *better*

1. The description of the **impact** this project would have on **improving the provision of services in the community (10 points):**

2A was omitted from the narrative

***2AA****- 0 points, was not present in the available field/ the stated impact was out of*  *the scope of the grant type*

*2B* *did not supply sufficient information*

***2BA*** *- 1-5 points, the impact was implied somewhere else in the application but*  *not*  *clearly, the impact is not clearly stated, did not supply data to show the*  *desired impact*

***2BB*** *- 6-9 points, it is clear that the impact of the grant dollars is greatly needed*  *and*  *aligns with the grant scope, however, the statement itself could have been*  *written/articulated better*

1. Program development and sustainability scores 3 to 9 incl. **(40 points):**

Detailed description of proposed **project and rationale** - max 5 points

***3AA*** *– 0 points, no description; description out of the scope of the RFP grant type*  *goals*

***3AB*** *– 1-4 points, the proposed project is not on target, lacks focus, not realistic,*  *concerns about readiness, not well defined*

1. Strategy for **implementation** - max 5 points

***4BA*** *– 0 points, no strategy*

***4BB*** *– 1-4 points, not realistic, not well defined*

5. Detailed and attainable **goals and objectives** directly linked to the objectives of the grant category - max 10 points

***5CA*** *– 0 points, the G/O are outside the scope of the grant type as stated in the*  *RFP*

***5CB*** *- 1-5 points, G/O did not align well with the scope of the grant, there are*  *some*  *elements outside the scope; there is no clear focus in the application, it*  *seems that the*  *effort is to cover across the board the expenses of running*  *a CAC rather than focus on*  *the target area for which the grant is designed*

***5CC*** *- 6-9 points, G/O are not well written, some redundancies, unclear elements*

6. Realistic activity and task **timelines** - max 5 points

***6DA*** *- 0-2 points, the application does not convey readiness to jump start the*  *project*

***6DB*** *- 3-4 points, concerns about how realistic the proposed timeline is*

7. Local **community/organizational support** for the proposed project - max 5 points

***7EA*** *– 0 points, no narrative, no existing support*

***7EB*** *- 1-4 points, the narrative does not convey targeted support for the project,*  *the*  *required letters of support are not complete/signed/ missing signatures/do*  *not express*  *support for the specific grant project but only general support for*  *the program*

**8. Measurement for success** - max 5 points

**8FA** – 0 points, no narrative

**8FB** – 1-4 points, no clearly defined measurements, measurements not aligned with the scope of the grant category, not realistic or measurable

9. **Sustainability** for proposed project, including program and plan to maintain the program if funding decreases or ends beyond the grant period – max 5

**9GA** - 0 points, no narrative, no plan

**9GB** - 1- 4 points, lack of detail about the sustainability, not-diversified organizational budget

10. Information about the **experience and capability** of the organization and any contractors to be used to implement and manage this project; previous experience managing **Federal grants**, including details on the applicant’s system for fiscal accountability **(5 points)**:

**10A** was omitted from the narrative (0)

**10B** the description failed to convey the ability and experience of the applicant to manage the grant (1-4 points)

11. Information about the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain your **organizational structure and operations**. Please include a copy of an organizational chart showing how your organization operates, including who manages the finances **(5 points)**:

**11A** was omitted from the narrative (0 points)

**11B** did not adequately describe the roles and responsibilities of the staff assigned to the project - 1-4 points, no clear assignments and roles, misalignment between the project assignments, the grant scope from the RFP and the budget time allocations)

12. The **budget (10 points)**:

12A did not match the goals and objectives of proposed project

**12AA** - 0 points, there is no connection to the proposed grant project, the main focus of the budget is outside the grant scope

**12AB -** 1-3 points, there is no distinct focus in the budget, rather it is spread out to cover the overall operations of the organization

12B presents some inconsistencies with the proposed project

**12BA** - 4-9 points, there are a few questionable expenses that are inconsistent with the nature of the project

13. The **budget narrative (5 points)**:

**13A** did not complete the required fields and tabs in the budget form, did not use the provided budget form (0-2 points)

**13B** no budget detail, descriptions and calculations of line items missing, cost budget calculations were not accurate (3-4 points)

1. The **budget timeline (5 points)**:

**14A** did not include the required information (0 points)

**14B** was inconsistent with the activity and task timeline proposed in the development plan, unrealistic, incomplete, not in alignment with the project timeline (1-4 points)