

First 5 Yuba Mini Grant - Scoring Matrix

Selection Guidelines – Proposals will be evaluated and graded on a 100-point scale, with the following value scale applied to the information provided. The Commission is committed to blending Proposition 10 funds, wherever possible, with other funds to form partnerships that maximize services and minimize program duplication and administrative costs. In doing so, the Commission is advancing its mission of “promoting the development and well-being of children 0 through 5.” It is the Commission’s vision that “all of Yuba County’s children will thrive in supportive, safe, nurturing and loving environments; are healthy, eager, and ready learners; and will become productive well-adjusted members of society.”

1. Applicant’s Background - 20 points max		
20-17 points	16-13 points	12-0 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearly describes the organization’s mission, target population, program(s) and service(s). • Provider/Organization clearly advances community support and understanding of the needs of children 0-5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider/Organization somewhat describes the organization’s mission, target population, program(s) and service(s). • Provider/Organization could advance community support and understanding of the needs of children 0-5. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider/Organization did not clearly describe the organization’s mission, target population, program(s) and service(s). • Provider/Organization does not seem advance community support and understanding of the needs of children 0-5.

2. Proposal - 60 points max		
60-49 points	48-37 points	36-0 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal clearly meets community needs identified in the Commission’s Strategic Plan • Proposal goal clearly fills a gap, supplements or strengthens existing resources in the county, as opposed to creating duplication or fragmentation. • Either a large number of participants are benefitted OR a few participants are benefitted deeply. • Proposal demonstrates strong partnerships or involvement with other community based organizations/agencies. • Proposal addresses sustainability plan beyond the grant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal somewhat meets community needs identified in the Commission’s Strategic Plan. • Proposal goals somewhat fills a gap, supplements or strengthens existing resources in the county. • Benefit to participants is limited to a small group or is not long-lasting. • Proposal has somewhat of a partnership or involvement with other community based organizations/agencies. • Proposal seems to be sustained beyond the grant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not clearly match the community needs identified in the Commission’s Strategic Plan OR unrealistically resolves too many needs. • Proposal goals do not seem to fill a gap, nor does it strengthen existing resources in the county or it may leave a void after grant has been issued • There does not seem to be any real benefits to participants. • Proposal has no partnerships or involvement with other community based organizations/agencies or seems to duplicate services. • Proposal sustainability beyond the grant period is unrealistic or incomplete.

3. Budget and Narrative - 20 points max

20-17 points	16-13 points	12-0 points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider/Organization demonstrates the financial capacity and experience to prepare and deliver the required reporting successfully. Little to no risk has been determined in granting funds. • Costs are clearly economical and realistic in general when compared to the numbers to be reached by professional intervention. • Budget utilizes clear categories for each amount and a detailed narrative. • Other funding sources, including partner funding are noted OR letters of support are attached. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider/Organization may have the financial capacity and experience to prepare and deliver the required reporting successfully. The risk in granting funds is minimal. • Costs may be economical and realistic in general when compared to the numbers to be reached by professional intervention, more evidence is required. • Budget and narrative were difficult to follow. • Other funding sources are minimally explained or a letter of support was provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider/Organization did not adequately demonstrate the financial capacity and experience to prepare and deliver the required reporting successfully. The risk is too high for the Commission to consider. • Costs do not seem economical and are not realistic in general when compared to the numbers to be reached by professional intervention. • Budget did not adequately provide categories for each amount or a detailed narrative was not provided. • No other funding sources or letters of support are provided.