

2018 Health Scoring Key

General Program Information (8%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program is itself a national model and/or has elements of rich evidence based practices • Program’s key features and intended client benefits are clearly stated • Alignment with the grantee’s Mission and Vision are clear and purposeful • Program sites are clearly listed • Location value is very clearly benefitting the participants/clients i.e. making it easier to access services • The program demonstrates understanding of how clients find them and get to them • The program demonstrates it actively tries to reach out to clients and let them know where they are and what services they provide
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program is clearly evidence based with proven elements of practice • Program’s key features and intended client benefits are clearly stated • Alignment with the grantee’s Mission and Vision are clear and purposeful • Program sites are clearly listed • Location value is described very well and clearly benefits the clients • Outreach to client is excellent and exhibits the program is making access to services easier
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program explained in detail the evidence based practices found in the program model • Program’s key features and intended client benefits are clearly stated • Alignment with the grantee’s Mission and Vision are clear and purposeful • Program sites are clearly listed • Some value to location is described • Organization demonstrates that it attempts to reach out to clients and make accessing services easier
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program may or may not be evidence based • Program’s key features and intended client benefits are clearly stated • Alignment with the grantee’s Mission and Vision are clear • Program sites are clearly listed • Some value to location is described (No extra effort for access apparent)
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program has no elements that are evidence based • Program’s key features and intended client benefits are stated, but marginally clear • Alignment with the grantee’s Mission and Vision marginally clear • Program sites are listed • Value of site location is not explained clearly or explanation is weak • Outreach to clients is lacking/very minimal
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program has no elements that are evidence based • Program’s key features and intended client benefits are not clearly explained and appear to be lacking • Alignment with the grantee’s Mission and Vision unclear • Program locations are listed • No value to location is demonstrated • Location appears to be more convenient for staff/administration rather than clients • No outreach efforts present
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	



2018 Health Scoring Key

Program Support (6%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question responses are thorough and beyond original expectations • Number of staff seems appropriate • Experience/Expertise of staff is directly aligned with the program’s key features and intended client benefits and ongoing training and support for staff is embedded in the model • If volunteers are used, their training program and protocols are exemplary • If volunteers are used, the added value is clearly stated and aligns with the program objectives
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part • Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question responses are thorough and beyond original expectations • Number of staff seems appropriate • Experience/Expertise of staff is directly aligned with the program’s key features and intended client benefits • Ongoing training and support for staff is apparent • If volunteers are used, their training appears strong and protocols are in place • If volunteers are used, the added value is clearly stated
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question responses are thorough • Number of staff seems appropriate • Experience/Expertise of staff is directly aligned with the program’s key features and intended client benefits • If volunteers are used, their training appears strong and protocols are in place • If volunteers are used, the added value is clearly stated
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions are answered satisfactorily • Number of staff seems appropriate • Experience/Expertise of staff is relevant to the program’s key features and intended client benefits • If volunteers are used, their training seems appropriate and protocols are in place • If volunteers are used, the added value is clearly stated
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions are answered • Staff listed, but experience/expertise of staff positions may or may not be relevant • If volunteers are used, their training seems appropriate, but protocols are not in place • If volunteers are used, the added value is marginally clear
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions are not answered completely • Staff listed, but experience/expertise of staff positions are not relevant • If volunteers are used, there is not an official training program • If volunteers are used, the added value is unclear
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	

2018 Health Scoring Key

Client Information (7%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient and current data and information presented, data is relevant to the local community • Clear, concise description of the target population and problem in the community • Sources for the data are cited and reputable • This organization has done their homework and you have no question that there is a need for this program
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part • Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient data is present • The data is current and relevant to the local community, sources are cited • Target population is clearly defined • Problem to address is clearly described, examples and details are provided as needed/appropriate
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data is current and relevant to local community • Good description of target population and problem is present, some details or examples are presented
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data is present and applicable – sources are cited • Need/ problem/ target population is described adequately
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data is outdated or not relevant to the local community, and/ or not from a reputable source-sources may or may not be cited • Need/ problem/ target population is not well described or not backed by any examples or details and reviewers may have many questions • Numerous weaknesses present in the description of need
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data is present • Weak description of need – no details or examples are presented to support the need for this program • Very unclear to reviewers what the problem or target population is
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	

2018 Health Scoring Key

Issue Area Specific Information (20%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unparalleled innovation with strong evidence of success/intended success • The primary method for program delivery is stated and explained. • Activities are very clearly described and significantly meet the needs of the specified priority and strategy(ies) • The connection between outcomes and activities is clearly made • Entrance and exit data for all indicators/outcomes are present
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part • Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Components of innovation present with strong evidence of success/intended success • The primary method for program delivery is stated and explained. • Activities are very clearly described and significantly meet the needs of the specified priority and strategy(ies) • The connection between outcomes and activities is clearly made • Entrance and exit data for most indicators/outcomes are present
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Components of innovation present with some evidence of success/intended success • The primary method for program delivery is stated and explained. • Activities are clearly described and more than adequate to meet the needs of the specified priority and strategy(ies) • The connection between outcomes and activities is clearly made • Entrance and exit data for some indicators/outcomes are present
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary method for program delivery is stated and explained. • Activities are described and adequate to meet the needs of the specified priority and strategy(ies) • The connection between outcomes and activities is clearly made • Entrance and exit data for overall indicators/outcomes may or may not be present
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary method for program delivery is stated and marginally explained. • Activities are described and mostly meet the needs of the specified priority and strategy(ies) • The connection between outcomes and activities is made, but lacking • Entrance and exit data for overall indicators/outcomes may or may not be present
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary method for program delivery is stated, but not well explained. • Activities are described, but do not clearly satisfy the needs of the specified priority and strategy(ies) • The connection between outcomes and activities is not clear • Entrance and exit data for overall indicators/outcomes is not present
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	

2018 Health Scoring Key

Collaboration/Coordination and Agreements (7%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration based on the grants definition is present and has a proven history or success • MOU/MOA for collaborations are in place and are exemplary • Referral relationships are present, have very good alignment and are explained in detail • Lists of referral agreements are provided, and each form is not attached. • The value of these partnerships is clearly described, system integration is apparent, and each partner provides added value to the program. • Communication and Data Sharing standards are in place and the value-add to client outcomes is extremely clear.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part • Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration based on the grants definition is present and at least one year old • MOU/MOA for collaborations are in place and are more than adequate • Referral relationships are present and explained in detail • Lists of referral agreements are provided, and each form is not attached. • The value of these partnerships is clearly described and provides strong added value to the program.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration based on the grants definition is present, but young • MOU/MOA for collaborations are in place and well described • Referral relationships are present and explained • Lists of referral agreements are provided, and each form is not attached. • The value of these partnerships is clearly described and provides some added value to the program.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration based on the grants definition may or may not be present • MOU/MOA for collaborations are in place and sufficient • Referral relationships may or may not be present • Lists of referral agreements are provided, and each form is not attached. • If applicable, the value of collaboration and referral is clearly described. • If no partnership examples are given, they have thoroughly explained why, and it is understandable why no other providers are involved.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration based on the grants definition may or may not be present • MOU/MOA for collaboration is weak. • Referral relationships may or may not be present • A list of referrals agreements are provided, but not necessarily complete • If so, the value of collaboration and referral is articulated, but not clear • If no partnership examples are given, they have not adequately explained why, and it is not understandable as to why no other providers are involved.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration and referrals may or may not be hinted at, but neither relationship is explained. • Documentation to support claims are not apparent or complete • If no partnership examples are given, they have not adequately explained why, and it is not understandable as to why no other providers are involved.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	

2018 Health Scoring Key

Budget and Budget Narratives (10%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for all applicable years is complete and adequate • Miscellaneous expenses and income are not present • It appears that the components of the program that have been explained are planned for in the budget and well articulated • Little to no fluctuation between years has occurred • Funding request seems reasonable • Funding % explanations are clear and helpful • Other funders are present, and/or the commitment of other funders is explained
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part • Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for all applicable years is complete and adequate • Miscellaneous expenses and income are not present • It appears that the components of the program that have been explained are planned for in the budget and well articulated • Little to no fluctuation between years has occurred • Funding request seems reasonable • Funding % explanations are clear and helpful
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for all applicable years is complete and adequate • Miscellaneous expenses and income may or may not be present, but are nominal and well explained • It appears that the components of the program that have been explained are planned for in the budget • Any line items that are up or down 10% between years are explained. • Funding request seems reasonable • Funding % explanations are clear and helpful
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for all applicable years is complete and adequate • If miscellaneous expenses are present, they are explained adequately • If miscellaneous income is present, it is explained adequately • It appears that the components of the program that have been explained are planned for in the budget • Any line items that are up or down 10% between years are explained. • Funding request seems reasonable • Funding % explanations are clear and helpful
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for all applicable years appears marginally complete • Miscellaneous expenses are present, but are not thoroughly explained • Miscellaneous income are present, but are not thoroughly explained • It appears that the components of the program that have been explained are mostly planned for in the budget • It appears there is some missing information • Funding request seems reasonable • Funding % explanations are marginally clear
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget for all applicable years appears incomplete • Miscellaneous expenses are present and are not explained • Miscellaneous income are present and are not explained • It appears that the components of the program that have been explained are mostly missing from the budget • It appears there is quite a bit of missing information • Funding request seems odd and %'s are not well explained
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	

2018 Health Scoring Key

Client Demographic Form and Narrative

10		
9		
8		
7		
6		
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No demographic data is missing • Demographic data reflects that of the target population
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some demographic data is missing • Explanation for missing demographic data is reasonable and makes sense • Demographic data reflects that of the target population
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of demographic data is missing • Explanation for missing demographic data is marginal • Demographic data does not reflect that of the target population
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most demographic data is missing • No explanations is provided • Demographic data does not reflect population



2018 Health Scoring Key

Logic Model Measurement Form

10		
9		
8		
7		
6		
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No output/indicator data is missing • Measurements seem congruent with the program components
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No output/indicator data is missing • Measurements seem incongruent with the program components
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be output/indicator data missing • Measurements seem incongruent with the program components
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most output/indicator data is missing • Measurements are not aligned with program



2018 Health Scoring Key

Logic Model Narratives and Evaluation Tool (30%)

10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior • “WOW” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs are listed and explained very clearly • Activities are listed and explained very clearly • It is clear what the lifecycle of a client looks like based on inputs and activities, and each component serves a specific purpose • The evaluation tools and methods are exemplary • Data is used to inform program improvements and a process is clearly in place to allow for this. • The highest priority is placed on data collection and integrity • Evaluation Tools were uploaded and support the explanation
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superior for the most part • Excellent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs are listed and explained very clearly • Activities are listed and explained very clearly • It is clear what the lifecycle of a client looks like based on inputs and activities • The evaluation tools and methods are more than adequate • Data is used to inform program improvements with examples of past changes • A high priority is placed on data collection and integrity • Evaluation Tools were uploaded and support the explanation
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extremely Good 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 or 2 major Strengths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs are listed and explained clearly • Activities are listed and explained clearly • It is clear what the lifecycle of a client looks like based on inputs and activities • The evaluation tools and methods are more than adequate • Data is used to inform program improvements • Evaluation Tools were uploaded and support the explanation
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds expectations • Very Good 	
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs are listed and explained adequately • Activities are listed and explained adequately • It is clear what the lifecycle of a client looks like based on inputs and activities • The evaluation tools and methods are adequate • Data is used to inform program improvements • Evaluation Tools were uploaded and support the explanation
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one major weakness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs are listed and explained, but not adequately • Activities are listed and explained, but not adequately • It is unclear what the full lifecycle of a client looks like based on inputs and activities • The evaluation tools and methods are less than adequate • Data may or may not be used to inform program improvements • Evaluation Tools were uploaded and support the explanation
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair • A few major weaknesses 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Unsatisfactory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputs are listed, but clearly missing items • Activities are listed, but seem weak • It is unclear what the lifecycle of a client looks like • The evaluation tools and methods appear to be inadequate • Data is not used to inform program improvements • Evaluation Tools were uploaded but do not support explanation
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses 	
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to answer 	