Nebraska Council on Developmental Disabilities Subaward Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet

Proje	ct:	
Appli	cant:	
Revie	ewer:	
Fill ir	this cover page after completing the attac	ched score sheet.
	cil Funds Requested	\$
	hing Funds	\$
	h amount is minimum of 25% vide Council Funds Requested by 3)	Yes No
Proje	ct meets target population:	Yes No
Proje	ct address State Plan Goal:	Yes No
9.1	Federal Grant Experience:	Yes No
9.2	Agreements Terminated/Disbarred:*	Yes No
*Appl	icants who have been disbarred by the US Fed	eral government are not eligible to receive funding under this RFA.
9.3	Project Summary	of 5 points
9.4	Qualifications	of 5 points
9.5	Coordination and Collaboration	of 15 points
9.6	Detailed Narrative	of 30 points
9.7	Accomplishments	of 15 points
9.8	Work Plan	of 30 points
9.9	Project Sustainability	of 20 points
9.10	Budget Justification	of 15 points
9.11	Budget	of 15 points
	Total Score:	of 150 points
(Scor	e is determined by averaging the points awards	ed by all reviewers)
Reviewer Recommendation: Award Application as Submitted		Award Application as Submitted
		Request Modifications for Application Award
		Deny Application

Record overall comments on the following pages.

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:				
	-	-		-	
asons for D	enial:				

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 p	project's goal, activities to be	undertaken to meet the	project goal, and
	ple with developmental disabi	lities and their families/g	uardians or others.
Comments:			
Recommendations for improve	ment:		
•			
Score: out of 5			
JCOIE, OUL OI J			

9.4 Qualifications	4–5 pts = Excellent	2-3 pts = Good	1 pt = Poor
Agency qualifications, mission	n, programs, and services are o	described.	
• Experience advocating on be	half of people with developmer	ntal disabilities and thei	r
families/guardians is describe	ed, including individuals from c	ulturally diverse backgr	ounds.
 Description of past accomplis 	shments in conducting activities	s similar to those propo	sed are included.
 Qualifications and experience 	e of persons who will be respon	sible for the project are	e defined.
Comments:			
Recommendations for improve	ment:		
Score: out of 5			

9.5 Coordination & Collaboration	11–15 pts = Excellent	6-10 pts = Good	1–5 pts = Poor
• List of current agency subawards a	nd contracts included.		•
• Evidence of working relationships a	nd community partnering	with shared goals and	activities is
documented.	, ,	_	
• Letter(s) of collaboration from com-	munity partners are include	ed.	
• Letters from agencies that are part	of the sustainability plan a	re included with descr	ription of what
they will do to support the project I	peyond subaward funds.		
• List of agency membership on com-		s, 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
• The goal and objective from th	e Council's State Plan that is being addressed is identified.
 Description of the systems cha 	nge that is being targeted is stated, if applicable.
	the applicant is proposing to do is clearly explained.
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvem	ent:
Control and COO	
Score: out of 30	

9.7 Accomplishments	11–15 pts = Excellent 6–10 pts = Good 1–5 pts = Poor
• Expected accomplishments of	the project are clearly stated.
• Output and outcomes to be a	chieved are clearly stated.
	I completion of the project will contribute to the State Plan Goal
identified.	, ,
	-term benefits of the project for individuals with developmental
	guardians and others is included.
Comments:	,
Recommendations for improve	nent:
Score: out of 15	
JCOIE OUL OI 13	

9.8 Work Plan	21–30 pts = Excellent 11–20 pts = Good 1–10 pts = Poor
• Time-referenced and measura	ble activities to meet the project goal are present, including one that
addresses project sustainabilit	
Expected outcomes including	
A realistic timeline is identified	which includes the goals, objectives, and activities are described in
the work plan.	3 , 3 ,
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvem	nent:
Score: out of 30	

9.9 Project Sustainability	14–20 pts = Excellent 7–13 pts = Good 1–6 pts = Poor
• The activities, features, or pro-	actices that the applicant wants to sustain once Council funds end are
clearly identified.	
A description of whether their	r agency or other agencies or collaborators will assume responsibility for
	features, or practices is detailed.
 Work plan includes a goal and 	d objectives related to sustainability of the project and/or its outcomes.
Comments:	
Recommendations for improve	ment:
Score: out of 20	

9.10 Budget Justification	11–15 pts = Excellent 6–10 pts = Good 1–5 pts = Poor		
A brief explanation of how th	e 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 	cil's federal funds and those charged to matching funds are identified.		
• Explanation of how phone, re	ent, or copying will be charged between Council federal funds and		
applicant's agency funds.			
• If Personnel expenses are red	quested, employee name, position, and percentage of time they will be		
working on the project is not	ed.		
Comments:			
Recommendations for improve	ment:		
Score: out of 15			

9.11 Budget	11–15 pts = Excellent 6–10 pts = Good 1–5 pts = Poor
	riate and related to the project work plan.
Budget does not include equipment, ongoing operating expenses, construction or renovation costs,	
or direct services for people v	with developmental disabilities unless these are part of a model
demonstration.	
• Budget includes a 25% match	n of the subaward. (Total of Council requested funds divided by 3. For a
	num match would be \$5,000.)
Source of matching funds is clearly identified.	
Comments:	
Recommendations for improvement:	
Convers out -5.15	
Score: out of 15	