

Proposal Review and Scoring Sheet Golden State Works Application		
Total Score (out of 105)	Name of Agency:	
	Date Reviewed:	
	Name of Reviewer:	
<p><i>Note to reviewers: Please fill in your scores, comments, and other information in the shaded areas only. The maximum points allowed for each section is in parentheses. You may allocate points for subsections/specific questions or use the criteria as guidance for assigning a score for each primary section. Prior to scoring the proposals please review the entire RFP Package.</i></p>		
Information located	Proposal Form Sections	Score
	Agency History and Capacity (maximum points allowed = 40)	
Narrative: Agency History and Capacity	The lead agency has demonstrated past success in providing services to the target population, including the size and scope of the programs.	
Narrative: Agency History and Capacity	Proposal specifically describes experience in developing unsubsidized job opportunities for formerly incarcerated people and any relationship with potential employers.	
Narrative: Agency History and Capacity	Agency demonstrates history of partnering with the criminal justice system.	
Narrative: Agency History and Capacity, Letters of Agreement or MOUs	If this is a collaborative, partners have a history of working together. Partners have experience working with this population and in providing services proposed.	
Narrative: Agency History and Capacity, Budget, Audit, attachments	Organization demonstrates stability both in terms of funding and management. Facilities are sufficient to handle crew-based work. The agency demonstrates ability to manage daily payroll. Organization has experience collaborating with evaluation efforts and managing data collection systems.	
<p><i>Comments:</i></p>		

	Program Design (maximum points allowed = 30)	
Narrative: Program Design	The proposal successfully addresses all of the specific requirements of the RFP and for replication of the model.	
Narrative: Program Design	The proposed job development and retention program is comprehensive and thorough. Incentives are clearly integrated into the program.	
Narrative: Program Design	The proposed program fits with the model outlined, and diverges only in ways that improve the quality of services offered.	
Narrative: Program Design and Letters of Agreements or MOUs	The roles of the partners are clear and realistic. The partnerships enhance the outreach, recruitment, and/or overall comprehensiveness of services provided. Relationships with CDCR are articulated and realistic.	
Program Design, Budget	The proposed program capitalizes on other programs or resources that can be used to serve the same population.	
<i>Comments:</i>		
	Staffing Qualifications (maximum points allowed = 15)	
Narrative: Staffing Qualifications, resumes, job descriptions	Qualifications of staff are appropriate for the services proposed. Staff possesses cultural competence with target population, as well as language capacity (if applicable).	
Narrative: Staffing Qualifications, resumes	Agency has a plan for and/or history of strong staff retention and development.	
P Narrative: Staffing Qualifications, resumes, job descriptions	Staff has experience implementing similar projects. Management staff has experience managing similar projects. For collaborative proposals, management staff has experience with collaborative partnerships.	
<i>Comments:</i>		

	Budget, Leveraging, Fiscal Responsibility (maximum points allowed = 15)	
Proposal narrative, budget, budget narrative	Other funding sources and/or in-kind donations will be leveraged with GSW funds.	
Narrative: History and Capacity, resumes	The agency has experience in managing government grants and contracts with multiple funding services.	
Budget, budget narrative	The overall program budget is sound and reasonable. Costs are appropriate for the program proposed and can accomplish services proposed.	
Budget & narrative, Program Design	An appropriate number of clients will be served for the GSW investment. Cost per client is reasonable.	
Budget, budget narrative	Line-item costs and available resources (including other program funding and non-monetary resources) are identified and explained, and relate to program design.	
<i>Comments:</i>		
TOTAL		

E/SLEB = 2-5 points

What were the overall strengths of this proposal?

What were the overall weaknesses of this proposal?