

AgeOptions FY 16-19 Nutrition RFP Scoring Tool - C2 Home Delivered Meals

Section 1: Basic Information		Section 2: Minimum Requirements		YES	NO
Applicant:		Application and all accompanying documents are typed, legible, complete and on AgeOptions application forms or a reasonable facsimile.			
Service(s) Proposed:		Proposed services are allowable per the service standards and definitions.			
Service Area:		The match (local cash and in-kind) is identified and allowable.			
Reviewer:		The match is, at a minimum, 15% of the applicant's cost less project income.			
		The application includes a budget justification.			
If the answer to any of the above questions is NO, do not proceed to Section 3					

Section 3: Scoring Tool			Service Score	Service Score
1. Needs Statement The applicant clearly describes the needs of the population to be served for this specific service.				
a. The applicant describes the target population (e.g. low income, Limited English Speaking, cultural, minority) and establishes a <u>need</u> for the service in the area by providing demographic and other data. They describe the social and economic needs of the service area.	Exceeds expectations = 4			
	Meets expectations = 2			
	Does not meet expectations = 0			
b. Indicate what other Home Delivered Meal providers operate in your proposed service area. Indicate if they use a fee-for-service or sliding-scale based payment system.	Question is for informational purposes only. Applicants will not be scored on this question.		NA	NA
Subtotal for Needs Statement			0	0
2. Program Plan and Design (Quality) The applicant clearly describes their plan and design for delivery of services.				
a. The applicant clearly describes the proposed program, and how the program is consistent with AgeOptions Service Standards outlined in the Request for Proposal.	Exceeds expectations = 2			
	Meets expectations = 1			
	Does not meet expectations = 0			
b. The applicant describes their vision for the program over the next five years, and describes how they see the site evolving to meet the needs of the target population.	Exceeds expectations = 2			
	Meets expectations = 1			
	Does not meet expectations = 0			
c. The applicant describes how the <u>cultural and language needs</u> of the target population will be incorporated into the program design.	Exceeds expectations = 2			
	Meets expectations = 1			
	Does not meet expectations = 0			
d. The applicant clearly describes how they will collaborate with existing community agencies to provide referrals to additional services and conduct outreach to older adults.	Exceeds expectations = 2			
	Meets expectations = 1			
	Does not meet expectations = 0			

e. The applicant clearly describes the program staffing, including supervisory and direct service staff, and how they meet the credentialing requirements of the proposed service. If a site manager staffs both a Congregate site and HDM program, describe how the supervisor divides his/her time between the two programs.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations = 0		
f. The applicant describes methods to attract and retain volunteers, and describes how volunteers are used in the provision of this service.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations = 0		
g. The applicant clearly describes how consumer input is collected and used; describes the formal complaint process; and provides examples of data that have been used to improve programs.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations = 0		
h. The applicant clearly describes opportunities for socialization between the meal recipient (client) and the meal delivery person, and indicates specific actions the program director will take to improve such socialization opportunities.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations = 0		
Subtotal for Program Plan and Design		0	0
3. Outreach, Target Group, Community Support (Access)			
a. The applicant provides a clear outreach plan to attract the target population and new participants (including a detailed plan of partnerships and collaborations), that creates visibility and uses a variety of methods such as social media and technology.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations = 0		
b. The applicant indicates how many of the following will be available at the site: i) Choice of meals ii) Ethnic meals iii) Second meals iv) Special meals (and specifies diet types) v) List additional ways to make the meals appealing	Applicant does 4+ of the listed activities; or provides Ethnic meals and 2+ of the remaining listed activities = 2 Applicant does 2-3 of the listed activities; or provides Ethnic meals and 1 of the remaining listed activities = 1 Applicant does 0-1 of the listed activities; or provides Ethnic meals and 0 of the remaining listed activities = 0		
Subtotal for Outreach, Target Group, Community Support		0	0
4. Innovation			
a. The applicant provides an explanation of an innovation the applicant plans to complete during the first year of this grant cycle that will positively impact productivity and/or cost effectiveness.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations (0)		
b. The applicant identifies what the agency does best; how the agency is unique; and what the agency is doing programmatically that no one else is doing in this service area.	Exceeds expectations = 2 Meets expectations = 1 Does not meet expectations (0)		
Subtotal for Innovation		0	0
5. Performance History, Overall Organization (Capacity)			
a. For currently funded applicants: in the last two years, the applicant has submitted <u>timely and accurate NAPIS reports and fiscal information</u> to AgeOptions. For new or past-funded applicants: applicant submitted timely and accurate program and fiscal reports for another contract or grant, per a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 2	Information accurate; and timely with 1 exception or was granted an extension = 4 Information accurate; and timely with 2-4 exceptions =3 Information inaccurate; and/or timely with 5 or more exceptions = 2 Applicant currently under corrective plan and/or notice of deficiency = 1		

	Applicant currently under notice of probation or suspension = 0		
b. For currently funded applicants: in the last two years, the applicant has submitted their audit timely and there were no findings. <i>For new or past-funded applicants: applicant submitted their audit timely per other contract or grant requirements and there were no findings, per a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 2</i>	Audit on time; and no findings = 3		
	Audit on time; and 1-2 issues of non-compliance with no material weaknesses, significant efficiencies or repeat findings = 2		
	Audit late; and/or 3 or more issues of non-compliance with no material weaknesses, significant efficiencies or repeat findings = 1		
	Audit late; and/or there were material weaknesses, significant efficiencies or repeat findings from the prior audit = 0		
c. For currently funded applicants: in its last Title III last monitoring, the applicant met AgeOptions <u>overall agency and fiscal standards</u> . The rating considers findings related to health and safety of client, lack of internal controls, poor service provision, inappropriate staffing. <i>For new or past-funded applicants: applicant met the overall standards of another grant or contract, per a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 2</i>	No relevant findings = 4		
	One-four relevant findings = 3		
	Five or more relevant findings = 2		
	Applicant currently under corrective plan and/or notice of deficiency = 1		
	Applicant currently under notice of probation or suspension = 0		
Subtotal for History, Overall Organization		0	0
6. Performance History, Specific to Proposed Services (Capacity)			
a. For currently funded applicants: The applicant has met or exceeded projections for units and clients for the proposed service in the proposed area for FY 14. <i>For new or past-funded applicants: The applicant has met or exceeded projections for units and clients for this service from another funding source, per a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 2</i>	Met or exceeded 100% of projections for units and clients = 4		
	Met 90-99% of projections for units and clients = 3		
	Met 89% or below of projections for units and clients = 2		
	Applicant currently under corrective plan and/or notice of deficiency = 1		
	Applicant currently under notice of probation or suspension = 0		
b. For currently funded applicants: The applicant's FY12-14 productivity trend for units and clients for the proposed service in the proposed area was stable or positive. <i>For new or past-funded applicants: The applicant had a stable or positive productivity trend over the past 3+ years for this service from another funding source, per a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 1</i>	FY 12-14 productivity trend showed a positive increase greater than 5% = 2		
	FY 12-14 productivity trend was stable (+/- 5%) = 1		
	FY 12-14 productivity trend showed a negative decrease greater than 5% = 0		
c. For currently funded applicants: in its last Title III last monitoring, the applicant met AgeOptions <u>standards for this service</u> . The rating considers findings related to health and safety of client, lack of internal controls, poor service provision, inappropriate staffing. <i>For new or past-funded applicants: applicant met the overall standards of another grant or contract, per a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 2</i>	No relevant findings = 4		
	One-four relevant findings = 3		
	Five or more relevant findings = 2		
	Applicant currently under corrective plan and/or notice of deficiency = 1		
	Applicant currently under notice of probation or suspension = 0		
d. The applicant has a history of providing the proposed service in the service area proposed. <i>For new applicants: source is a letter of reference/recommendation. Maximum score = 1</i>	Applicant has provided this service in the proposed area for 10+ years = 2		
	Applicant currently provides this service in the proposed area; or has provided this service in another suburban Cook County area = 1		

	Applicant does not currently provide this service and has not provided this service in suburban Cook County = 0		
Subtotal for Performance History, Specific to Proposed service		0	0
7. Budget			
a. The budget justification is clear, logical and specifically describes the program and cost allocation as well as how project income will be solicited.	Exceeds expectations = 2		
	Meets expectations = 1		
	Does not meet expectations = 0		
b. The proposed <u>project income</u> is logical, reasonable, and consistent with previous years.	The proposed project income is logical based on history = 2		
	The proposed project income is not logical based on history = 0		
c. The proposed <u>in-kind income</u> is logical, reasonable, and consistent with previous years.	The proposed in-kind income is logical based on history = 2		
	The proposed in-kind income is not logical based on history = 0		
d. The level of match is at least 15%. Preference is given to local cash.	Proposed match is over 25% with at least 15% local cash = 3		
	Proposed match is 20% with at least 5% local cash = 2		
	Proposed match is 15% with no local cash = 1		
	Proposed match is under 15% = 0		
e. The numbers of proposed clients to be served are achievable given the proposed outreach activities.	Number of proposed clients is achievable given prior fiscal year and outreach plan = 2		
	Number of proposed clients is possible given prior fiscal year and outreach plan = 1		
	Number of proposed clients is unlikely given prior fiscal year and outreach plan = 0		
f. The numbers of proposed units are achievable given the proposed outreach activities and the applicant's past history.	Number of proposed units is achievable given prior fiscal year and outreach plan = 2		
	Number of proposed units is possible given prior fiscal year and outreach plan = 1		
	Number of proposed units is unlikely given prior fiscal year and outreach plan = 0		
g. The proposed AgeOptions <u>unit rate</u> is logical, reasonable, and within a range appropriate to available funding and network history. (Point of comparison is the AgeOptions FY15 average budgeted unit rate.)	Proposed AgeOptions unit rate is 103% or below the FY 15 average = 3		
	Proposed AgeOptions unit rate is within 104-8% of the FY 15 average = 2		
	Proposed AgeOptions unit rate is 109-112% over the FY 15 average = 1		
	Proposed AgeOptions unit rate is over 113% of the FY 15 average = 0		
Subtotal for Budget		0	0

TOTAL SCORE=====>

Summary - GENERAL

Section	Points scored	Points scored
Needs Statement	0.0	0.0
Program Plan & Design	0.0	0.0
Outreach, Target Group, Community Support (Access)	0.0	0.0
Innovation	0.0	0.0
Performance History, Overall Organization (Capacity)	0.0	0.0
Performance History, Specific to Proposed Services (Capacity)	0.0	0.0
Budget	0.0	0.0

Total	0.0	0.0
--------------	------------	------------