AWC Alternative Response Team Grant scoring rubric

Reviewer:

Applicant:

Rating		
Section	**Points**	**Points awarded**
Program rating	50	
Budget rating	30	
Partnerships rating	20	
Total points	100	

Program rating criteria	**Points awarded (50 points)**
The proposed program description is consistent with the guiding principles identified in the state budget proviso. *This funding must be used to reimburse cities for documented costs associated with creating co-responder teams within different alternative diversion models including law enforcement assisted diversion programs, community assistance referral and education programs, and as part of mobile crisis teams. Cities are encouraged to partner with each other to create a regional response model. In awarding these funds, the association must prioritize applicants with demonstrated capacity for facility-based crisis triage and stabilization services.*	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-10):
Identifies program objectives, measurable goals, and outcomes. Goals and objectives are reasonable for the given timeframe.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Describes the need for the program in the identified service area including challenges and roadblocks to starting a program previously.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Clearly identifies target population for the program. Program as described meets the needs of the population.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Describes the qualifications, role, capacity, and authority of key individuals including coordination efforts, selection of staff, and service providers and training plan. Plan clearly shows a chain of command.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
All required key stakeholders were identified and a description was provided outlining how each stakeholder's level of participation in the program, responsibilities to the program, and resources they will contribute.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Identifies best and evidenced-based practices to be used in the program.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Includes a program timeline and addresses any anticipated implementation challenges and how applicant plans to address these challenges.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Applicant includes list of locally-available facility-based crisis triage and stabilization services as well as the number of beds in these facilities.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Score (Out of 50)	
Notes:	

Budget rating criteria	**Points awarded (30 points)**
Budget information details how funds will be leveraged to support the program.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-10):
Complete and detailed budget information is provided in each section, including language supporting each expense.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Overall, the items in the program budget are clearly justified and reasonable in terms of planned program activities	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Applicant explains how program will continue after grant funds are no longer available.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Applicant provides details of non-ARTG funding that will be used to support the program.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-5):
Score (Out of 30)	
Notes:	

Partnership rating criteria	**Points Awarded (20 points)**
Applicant provided program partners including their level of participation in the program.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-10):
Letters of Commitment were provided by key stakeholders and outline their level of participation in the program, responsibilities to the program, resources they will contribute, and their agreement to comply with any data collection and reporting requirements.	Yes No Concerns Points Awarded (1-10):
Score (Out of 20)	
Notes:	

Follow up questions:

Concerns/Comments:

- ❑ I would fully recommend funding this program. **Amount:**
- ❑ I would recommend funding this program with some reservations. **Amount:**
- ❑ I would not recommend funding this program.