

**ORGANIZATION CRITERIA**

<b>Organization Profile</b>			
<b>Organization General</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship of mission and goals to proposed service(s)</li> <li>History of providing proposed service(s) or similar service(s)</li> <li>Number and qualifications of independent governing board members</li> <li>Ratio of Columbia residents on governing board</li> </ul>			
<b>Rating:</b>	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Limited
<b>Organization Financial</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial statement</li> <li>Financial procedures including board oversight</li> <li>Level of other sources of funding</li> <li>Ratio of management and fundraising expenses to program expenses</li> <li>Level of reserve funds</li> <li>Employee compensation levels</li> </ul>			
<b>Rating:</b>	3 High	2 Moderate	1 Limited

<b>3-High</b>	High level of capacity
<b>2-Moderate</b>	Moderate level of capacity
<b>1-Limited</b>	Limited level of capacity

**PROGRAM CRITERIA**

<b>Program Narrative form</b>				
<b>Statement of the Issue Being Addressed</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevancy of issue to be addressed to the issue identified in RFP</li> <li>Use of data to describe the issue</li> <li>Use of data to describe the population affected by the issue</li> <li>Use of data to describe the effect of the issue on Columbia, MO</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Consumers</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of data to describe the program consumers</li> <li>Rationale for the target program consumers</li> <li>Relevance of target population to RFP</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Goal</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevance of stated goal(s) to organization's goal(s), the issue(s) to be addressed, and program consumers.</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

**PROGRAM CRITERIA (cont'd.)**

<b>Program Narrative form (cont'd.)</b>				
<b>Program Description</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the proposed program</li> <li>• Relevance of program services to the issue identified in the RFP</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Access</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program location and hours of service</li> <li>• Relevance of consumer eligibility criteria to target population of program and RFP</li> <li>• Program cost to consumer</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Quality</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance with applicable external requirements</li> <li>• Use of available best practices and/or standards</li> <li>• Strength of evidence to support the proposed program service(s)</li> <li>• Presence of innovative policies and practices</li> <li>• Level of partnership and collaboration</li> <li>• Utilization and strength of quality improvement process</li> <li>• Utilization of consumer feedback in quality improvement process</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Personnel</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program personnel qualifications</li> <li>• Program staffing levels</li> <li>• Program personnel compensation levels</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Service Need</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement of service need in Columbia, MO</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Citations</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adherence to required citation methodology</li> <li>• Appropriateness of sources</li> <li>• Relevance, quality, and quantity of citations</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Budget</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of detail in budget narrative</li> <li>• Adequacy of overall program funding</li> <li>• Ratio of City of Columbia funding to other sources of funding</li> <li>• Correlation between program expenses and program description/services/performance measures</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

**PROGRAM CRITERIA (cont'd.)**

<b>Program Information form</b>				
<b>Program Service Levels</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total number of individuals to be served</li> <li>• Total cost per individual served</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Consumer Demographics</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflection of program consumers description</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Service(s)</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unit of service rate (cost)</li> <li>• Amount of service</li> <li>• Number of individuals to be served</li> <li>• Average units of service per individual</li> <li>• Average cost per individual</li> <li>• Utilization of available third party payer sources</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Funding Request Justification</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justification for level of funding from the City of Columbia</li> <li>• Basis for funding request from the City of Columbia</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor
<b>Program Performance Measures</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationship of outcome(s) to program goal(s) and issue identified in RFP</li> <li>• Relativity and feasibility of outcome indicator(s)</li> <li>• Relativity, validity, and reliability of the method(s) of measurement</li> </ul>				
<b>Rating:</b>	4 Excellent	3 Good	2 Fair	1 Poor

<b>4-Excellent</b>	Exceptionally well-conceived and thoroughly developed response to the given question. Content resonates deeply with the expectations and impact goals of the RFP.
<b>3-Good</b>	Response is largely relevant, sufficient, and appropriate to address the criterion, although some minor inconsistencies or weaknesses may remain.
<b>2-Fair</b>	Response pertains in some intelligible and useful way to the stated criterion, but otherwise is significantly unclear, inaccurate, incomplete, inconsistent, or irrelevant.
<b>1-Poor</b>	Does not meet minimal standards. Response is prohibitively unclear, inaccurate, incomplete, inconsistent, irrelevant to the stated criterion, or otherwise exhibits a clear conflict with the goals of the RFP.