Minnesota Department of Health logo

# Attachment F: Application Evaluation Scoring Criteria Communities That Care (CTC) Minnesota – Youth Substance Prevention Grants

A numerical scoring system will be used to evaluate eligible applications. Scores will be used to develop final recommendations. Applicants are encouraged to score their own application using the evaluation scoresheet before submitting their application. This step is not required but may help ensure applications address the criteria evaluators will use to score applications.

Rating levels for Attachment A and C

| Rating or Score | Description |
| --- | --- |
| Excellent or 5 | Outstanding level of quality; significantly exceeds all aspects of the minimum requirements; high probability of success; no significant weaknesses. |
| Very Good or 4 | Substantial response: meets in all aspects and in some cases exceeds, the minimum requirements; good probability of success; no significant weaknesses. |
| Good or 3 | Generally, meets minimum requirements; probability of success; significant weaknesses, but correctable. |
| Marginal or 2 | Lack of essential information; low probability of success; significant weaknesses, but correctable. |
| Unsatisfactory or 1 | Fails to meet minimum requirements; little likelihood of success; needs major revision to make it acceptable. |

Rating levels for Attachments B and letters of commitment

| Rating or Score | Description |
| --- | --- |
| All points allocated | Response meets the requirements outlined. |
| Partial points allocated | Incomplete response provided. |
| No points allocated | Answer was left blank and/or did not follow instructions. |

Scoring selection – scored up to 100 points

| **Proposal Components** | **Possible Points** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Attachment A – Organizational Capacity | 15 |
| 1. Attachment A – Assess Community Need | 25 |
| 1. Attachment A – Project Design, Implementation, and Performance Measurement | 15 |
| 1. Attachment A – Equity, Focus Populations, and Cultural Competence | 15 |
| 1. Attachment B – Activity Timeline | 20 |
| 1. Attachment C - Budget | 5 |
| 1. Letters of Commitment | 5 |
| Total: | 100 points |

Attachment A: Organizational capacity (15 points)

| Criteria | Score (1-5) |
| --- | --- |
| The applicant organization describes the following:   * Mission statement * History and relationship working with the community identified * Experience working in youth substance use prevention * Describes the organization’s current efforts and/or plans to ensure equity within organizational policies and practices * Capacity in developing and facilitating a coalition * If applicable: experience with the Strategic Planning Framework (SPF) and/or the Communities That Care (CTC) model | X |
| The applicant organization currently provides similar services that are directly relatable to the activities outlined in the grant proposal. They are well positioned and experienced in providing the proposed programming for the community. | X |
| The applicant demonstrates past achievements in similar programming which complement and/or are a natural extension of the proposed project. | X |

Attachment A: Assess community need (25 points)

| Criteria | Score (1-5) |
| --- | --- |
| The applicant organization will describe the community and/or population you intend to serve:   * Location, demographics, and other information to provide insights to the community * Specific needs related to youth cannabis and other substance use * Local youth substance use data and/or high-risk health factors (or lack thereof) * *If applicable:* additional local qualitative and quantitative data sources * *If applicable:* indicate if there is a functioning prevention coalition in the community | X |
| The applicant organization will describe their process for assessing the community’s needs. Shared experience(s) collecting information, processes and/or protocols, and tools used. | X |
| The applicant organization will describe their process for engaging with key collaborators. | X |
| The applicant organization will describe their process for implementation of the Communities That Care model. | X |
| The applicant organization identifies a problem related to substance use and the disproportionate impact it has had on different geographical and/or racial/ethnic/cultural communities in Minnesota. | X |

Attachment A: Project design, implementation, and performance measurement (15 points)

| Criteria | Score (1-5) |
| --- | --- |
| The applicant organization outlines the activities of the proposal. The activities align with the youth substance use prevention strategies outlined in the grant guidance. Applicant describes whether proposal will implement activities within an existing coalition or if a new coalition collaborative will be developed. | X |
| The applicant organization has defined outcomes (objectives) that are attainable during the five-year grant period and document an intended change(s). The outcomes are in alignment with the overall goal of preventing youth substance use in Minnesota. | X |
| The applicant has described how program data will be used to guide decision making throughout the project. The applicant describes how data findings will be reviewed and shared with relevant staff, community partners, and/or the impacted community. | X |

Attachment A: Equity, focus populations, and cultural competence (15 points)

| Criteria | Score (1-5) |
| --- | --- |
| The applicant has laid out a plan to ensure culturally responsive services will be provided under this grant proposal. The applicant’s proposed activities are aligned with the cultural practices and values of the intended community. | X |
| The applicant has demonstrated that they can provide services in a language(s) other than English. These language skills are directly relatable to the focus population(s). | X |
| The applicant shows a strong history of working to eliminate health disparities and advancing health equity for the identified focus population(s). | X |

Attachment B: Activity timeline (20 points)

| Criteria | Score |
| --- | --- |
| Part 1: Applicant provided a response regarding the feasibility of the proposed project timeline. | 2 points = Yes  1 point = Partially responded  0 points = No |
| Part 1: Applicant provided a response regarding the feasibility of MDH’s proposed implementation timeline. | 2 points = Yes  1 point = Partially responded  0 points = No |
| Part 1: Applicant provided a response regarding the organization’s readiness to implement the CTC model. | 2 points = Yes  1 point = Partially responded  0 points = No |
| Part 1: Applicant provided a response regarding the community’s readiness to implement the CTC model. | 2 points = Yes  1 point = Partially responded  0 points = No |
| Part 1: Applicant provided a response regarding the possible challenges and roadblocks to CTC implementation. | 2 points = Yes  1 point = Partially responded  0 points = No |
| Part 1: Applicant provided a response for technical assistance and support needs from MDH. | 2 points = Yes  1 point = Partially responded  0 points = No |
| Part 2: Activity timeline includes Phases 1, 2, and 3 of CTC. | 3 = Yes  2 = Two of three phases  1 = One of three phases  0 = No |
| Part 2: Activity timeline aligns with the milestones outlined in the CTC guidance. | 2 = Yes  1 = Partially aligned to milestones  0 = No |
| Part 2: Activity timeline provides an estimated completion timeframe for each milestone and their respective activities. | 2 = Yes 1 = Partially included  0 = No |
| Part 2: Activity timeline notes any roadblocks or challenges that may impact reaching the estimated completion date. | 2 = Yes 1 = Partially responded 0 = No |
| Part 2: Activity timeline is for a 25-month timeframe (June 1, 2025 – June 30, 2027). | 1 = Yes 0 = No |

Attachment C: Budget spreadsheet (5 points)

| Criteria | Score (1-5) |
| --- | --- |
| The budget detail and justification/narrative provide a description of how funds will be used for the grant period. The expenses will contribute to the project goal(s). The expenses included in the budget detail and justification support activities outlined in the work plan. The narrative detail in the budget provides detail of how the budget numbers were determined. | X |

Letters of commitment (5 points)

| Criteria | Score: |
| --- | --- |
| Did the applicant provide a minimum of three letters of commitment from:   * If an existing coalition/collective: current members * If forming a new coalition/collection: organizations interested in joining | 3 points = Yes  2 points = Only two letters of commitment  1 point = Only one letter of commitment  0 points = No |
| Does the organization writing the letters of commitment indicate an understanding of their role in the project? | 1 = Yes  0 = No |
| Do the organizations writing the letters of commitment indicate their relationship in the community that will be served? | 1 = Yes  0 = No |
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To obtain this information in a different format, call: 651-201-3929.