



## Minimum Criteria and Technical Scoring Rubric

### **Minimum Criteria**

Each mill levy-funding proposal must meet the minimum criteria to be move forward in the review process.

1. *All areas of the proposal are completed.* Yes ☐ No ☐
2. *Proposal submitted by the deadline posted on the Funding Opportunity Announcement.*  
Yes ☐ No ☐
3. *At least one priority area (as defined in the Funding Opportunity Announcement) is addressed.* Yes ☐ No ☐
4. *Proposal identifies specific benefit(s) to individuals living in the City & County of Denver with I/DD.* Yes ☐ No ☐
5. *The project goal(s) is clear.* Yes ☐ No ☐
6. *Proposed outcomes are clearly defined.* Yes ☐ No ☐
7. *The accompanying budget is complete.* Yes ☐ No ☐

### **Technical Scoring Rubric**

#### **Proposals for new and continuing mill levy funding – possible 28 points**

*Below is the scoring rubric used in evaluating proposals for new and continuing mill levy funding that meet the minimum criteria. See each section for the most points available for the area.*

#### **Uniqueness/innovation of project (maximum possible points: 3)**

- 3   No other resources or proposals address the need identified in the proposal  
  2   Other resource(s) or proposal(s) address the need, but this proposal is unique in approach or service delivery model  
  0   Other resource(s) or proposal(s) address the need in the same way but:  
      1   this proposal is more cost-effective  
      1   this proposal proposes to serve a higher number of individuals

#### **Self-determination, empowerment, and person-centeredness (maximum possible points: 3)**

- 3   Proposal includes elements of self-determination, empowering individuals with I/DD and/or person-centered thinking in the described service delivery model  
  0   Proposal does not include these elements in the described service delivery model

**Effectiveness/outcomes (maximum possible points: 3)**

3 Proposal clearly defines measurable outcomes within a specific timeline

2 Proposal defines measurable outcomes, timeline not defined or not achievable within project timeline

0 Proposal does not include measurable outcomes or is lacking detail to determine how outcomes will be measured.

**Diversity, Equity and Inclusion: (maximum possible points 3)**

3 The proposal demonstrates:

- An intentional collection of people that is representative to the demographic characteristic of the Denver community and,
- Every person is valued, respected and supported in their right to be incorporated fully into the fabric of society, regardless of his/her/their disability

0 The proposal does not include these elements.

**Access: (maximum possible points 1)**

1 Proposal demonstrates steps that will be taken to ensure equal access to the program including identifying and eliminating barriers that may prevent full program participation. Examples included, but are not limited to transportation, remote participation options, and adaptations or tools necessary for participation.

0 The proposal does not include these elements.

**Collaboration: Working with one or more other agencies to further project goals/efforts (maximum possible points: 1)**

1 Proposal describes multi-agency effort, networking or other partnerships (can include joint efforts, donations, trades with other agencies)

0 Proposal describes a single agency effort

**High-priority area of need (maximum possible points: 1)**

1 Proposal addresses a high-priority area of need as established by Community Advisory Council and stakeholder feedback (included in the Call for Proposals)

0 Proposal addresses an area of need other than the established high priority/priorities

**Budget alignment (maximum possible points: 1)**

1 Budget aligns with scope of work in terms of population served, resources needed, and project timeline. If agency provides services beyond the scope of work (non-Denver residents, private pay, etc.), the proposal addresses how that cost is supported

0 Budget is not aligned with the scope of work as described above

**Financial viability (maximum possible points: 1)**

1 Proposal indicates that the project is financially viable: all associated allowable costs are accounted for in the budget and proposal, including space, equipment, transportation, and administrative expenses

0 Proposal does not indicate financial viability as described above

**Expenses directly benefit individuals with I/DD (maximum possible points: 2**

2 All budget items directly benefit individuals with I/DD and are not business expenses with little or no clear direct benefit to individuals with I/DD

1 Most budget items directly benefit individuals with I/DD and are not business expenses with little or no clear direct benefit to individuals with I/DD

0 No budget items directly benefit individuals with I/DD but are business expenses with little or no clear direct benefit to individuals with I/DD

**Sustainability (maximum possible points: 1**

1 Proposal includes a plan for the proposed services/supports to be sustainable without mill levy funding within the next two years

0 Proposal does not include a plan for the proposed services/supports to be sustainable without mill levy funding within the next two years

**Proposals for continuing mill levy funding only – possible additional 8 points**

*Below is the additional criteria used in evaluating proposals for continuing mill levy funding only.*

**Accountability (maximum possible points: 2**

2 Project has obtained or exceeded expected results and produced clear measurable outcomes within the proposed timeframe.

1 Project has obtained expected results in part and can explain the difference between expected and obtained outcomes.

0 Project did not obtain the expected results in whole or in part and is not able to provide explanation.

**Responsiveness (maximum possible points: 2**

2 Project personnel are consistently responsive to requests for information or updates about the project from RMHS staff, DHS staff, individuals accepting services or other stakeholders.

1 Project personnel are usually responsive to requests for information or updates about the project from RMHS staff, DHS staff, individuals accepting services or other stakeholders.

0 Project personnel are usually unresponsive to requests for information or updates about the project from RMHS staff, DHS staff, individuals accepting services or other stakeholders.

**Reporting (maximum possible points: 2**

2 All reporting including monthly metrics, quarterly reports, and invoices is submitted on or before the deadline.

1 Some reporting including monthly metrics, quarterly reports, and invoices is submitted on or before the deadline. Project personnel have occasionally had to be reminded to submit metrics, reports, and/or invoices.

0 Little to no reporting including monthly metrics, quarterly reports, and invoices is submitted on or before the deadline. Project personnel have consistently (more often than not) had to be reminded to submit metrics, reports, and/or invoices.

**Budget management (maximum possible points: 2**

2 Invoices are within the approved budget and require little to no budget modifications. Project ended the term within 10 percent of budget or anticipated underutilization of budget was communicated to RMHS prior to the last two months of the term.

1 Invoices are sometimes within the approved budget and require no more than one budget modification. Project ended the term within 20 percent of budget or anticipated underutilization of budget was communicated to RMHS prior to the last month of the term.

0 Invoices are rarely or never within the approved budget and/or required multiple budget modifications. Project ended the term more than 20 percent under budget and/or underutilization of budget was not communicated to RMHS prior to the last month of the term.