

Requested Modifications (Contingencies):

Subrecipient must make the following **required changes/corrections** to their application:

Subrecipient is to be given the following **suggestions** to make their application stronger:

Reasons for Denial:

The target population is persons with developmental disabilities.

_____ Yes _____ No

The project addresses one of the priorities of the Council's State Plan.

_____ Yes _____ No

9.1 Federal Grant Experience	Yes	No
• Applicant/agency has previous experience with federal grant funds. Describes/demonstrates knowledge of Uniform Grant Guidance/HHS Grants Guidance		
Comments:		

9.2 Terminated / Disbarred	Yes	No
• Summary of any agreements executed within the last five years with federal awarding agencies or pass-through entities terminated for cause or where specific conditions were placed on applicant, or applicant disbarment by the US federal government is provided, if applicable. If an Applicant has been disbarred by the United States Federal government, it is not eligible to receive funding under this RFA.		
Comments:		

9.3 Project Summary	4–5 pts = Excellent	2–3 pts = Good	1 pt = Poor
• Summary clearly states the project's goal, activities to be undertaken to meet the project goal, and the projected impact on people with developmental disabilities and their families/guardians or others.			
Comments:			
Recommendations for improvement:			
Score: ___ out of 5			

9.4 Qualifications	4–5 pts = Excellent	2–3 pts = Good	1 pt = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency qualifications, mission, programs, and services are described. • Experience advocating on behalf of people with developmental disabilities and their families/guardians is described, including individuals from culturally diverse backgrounds. • Description of past accomplishments in conducting activities similar to those proposed are included. • Qualifications and experience of persons who will be responsible for the project are defined. 			
Comments:			
Recommendations for improvement:			
Score: ___ out of 5			

9.5 Coordination & Collaboration	11–15 pts = Excellent	6–10 pts = Good	1–5 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of current agency subawards and contracts included. • Evidence of working relationships and community partnering with shared goals and activities is documented. • Letter(s) of collaboration from community partners are included. • Letters from agencies that are part of the sustainability plan are included with description of what they will do to support the project beyond subaward funds. • List of agency membership on community focus groups, teams, coalitions, or other local organizations is included. 			
Comments:			
Recommendations for improvement:			
Score: ___ out of 15			

9.6 Detailed Narrative	21–30 pts = Excellent	11–20 pts = Good	1–10 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goal and objective from the Council’s State Plan that is being addressed is identified. • Description of the systems change that is being targeted is stated, if applicable. • A detailed description of what the applicant is proposing to do is clearly explained. 			
Comments:			
Recommendations for improvement:			
Score: ___ out of 30			

9.7 Accomplishments	11–15 pts = Excellent 6–10 pts = Good 1–5 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected accomplishments of the project are clearly stated. • Output and outcomes to be achieved are clearly stated. • Explanation of how successful completion of the project will contribute to the State Plan Goal identified. • Explanation of short and long-term benefits of the project for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families/guardians and others is included. 	
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvement:	
Score: ___ out of 15	

9.8 Work Plan	21–30 pts = Excellent 11–20 pts = Good 1–10 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-referenced and measurable activities to meet the project goal are present, including one that addresses project sustainability. • Expected outcomes including projected numbers are stated. • A realistic timeline is identified which includes the goals, objectives, and activities are described in the work plan. 	
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvement:	
Score: ___ out of 30	

9.9 Project Sustainability	14–20 pts = Excellent 7–13 pts = Good 1–6 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The activities, features, or practices that the applicant wants to sustain once Council funds end are clearly identified. • A description of whether their agency or other agencies or collaborators will assume responsibility for maintaining these activities, features, or practices is detailed. • Work plan includes a goal and objectives related to sustainability of the project and/or its outcomes. 	
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvement:	
Score: ___ out of 20	

9.10 Budget Justification	11–15 pts = Excellent 6–10 pts = Good 1–5 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A brief explanation of how the funds requested will support the project goals and activities is provided. • Detail of how the applicant arrived at the budget figures is included. • Costs to be charged to Council’s federal funds and those charged to matching funds are identified. • Explanation of how phone, rent, or copying will be charged between Council federal funds and applicant’s agency funds. • If Personnel expenses are requested, employee name, position, and percentage of time they will be working on the project is noted. 	
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvement:	
Score: ___ out of 15	

9.11 Budget	11–15 pts = Excellent 6–10 pts = Good 1–5 pts = Poor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget expenses are appropriate and related to the project work plan. • Budget does not include equipment, ongoing operating expenses, construction or renovation costs, or direct services for people with developmental disabilities unless these are part of a model demonstration. • Budget includes a 25% match of the subaward. (Total of Council requested funds divided by 3. For a \$15,000 subaward, the minimum match would be \$5,000.) • Source of matching funds is clearly identified. 	
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvement:	
Score: ___ out of 15	