

Criteria	4= Excellent	3=Above Average	2= Average	1= Unsatisfactory	NA Total Scores Will be on a scale from 1-4, based on an average of criteria scores. In the event that a criteria is not relevant to a proposal it will be removed and will not impact the average score
1. Clearly identifies the outcome(s) the proposal is intended to impact and is tied to the Interactive Opioid Dashboard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Everything in criteria 3 AND: - Extensively outlines the high level outcomes the proposal will work to impact - Provides unequivocal justification, backed by research and historical examples, for why the proposal will impact the aforementioned metrics - Outcomes listed are tracked in the RMP Opioid Dashboard or convincing justification is given as to why they should be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensively outlines the high level outcomes the proposal will work to impact - Provides good justification, backed by research and historical examples for why their proposal will impact the aforementioned metrics - Outcomes listed are tracked in the RMP Opioid Dashboard or convincing justification is given as to why they should be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outlines the high level outcomes the proposal will work to impact - Outcomes may have an unclear or tenuous casual relationship with the KPI's mentioned in criteria 2, but justification is at least provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not provide outcomes - Justification for the outcomes is not given 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application
2. Clear, measurable, and reasonable targets and metrics to hold accountability to impact identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Everything in criteria 3 AND: - Details barriers that might prevent them from achieving their targets, the likelihood of them occurring, and what they will do to overcome/avoid them such that their targets are not impacted negatively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensively outlines targets for listed outcomes, and KPI's to monitor along the way which ladder up to the outcomes - Provides strong justification, backed by research and historical examples as to how they arrived at a target (calculations included) which is ambitious but within reason - In the case that there is no research or historical examples to support their targets, convincing justification is given by another means 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outlines the targets for listed outcomes, and KPI's to monitor along the way which ladder up to the outcomes - Thoroughly explains their rationale for arriving at a target even if no hard numbers are provided by way of historical examples or case studies - In the case that there is no research or historical examples to support their targets, the reason for their metric and target selections is provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not provide KPI's or Targets - Justification for Targets is not given - Targets are unreasonable or not ambitious enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application
3. Proposal has been demonstrated to be highly effective, or promising and emerging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria in Category 3 Above Average AND - Highlights similar strategies or clearly demonstrates other places it has worked on a smaller scale where the results have met or exceeded expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrated to be informed by nationally recognized outcomes, best practices or evidenced based approaches supported by research (reserved for those strategies which are supported by large bodies of research OR for which the research demonstrates the strategy is highly effective) - In the event that the approach of the applicant is novel and innovative, it has been demonstrated to be promising or emerging can be expected to be effective (with data, case studies, analogous approaches, community voice and perspective, etc). Additionally the applicant articulates how they will improve upon how this strategy has been implemented historically (if applicable) - Willingness to undergo an evaluation process which goes above and beyond the reporting requirements necessary to receive funds to become proven 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrated to be informed by nationally recognized outcomes, best practices or evidenced based approaches supported by research (reserved for those strategies which are more tenuously supported by evidence or which may not have a high demonstrated efficacy but are still effective) - Strategy may diverge slightly from the supported research with no justification - In the event that the approach of the applicant is novel and innovative, reasonable evidence is provided that demonstrates the approach can be expected to be effective by highlighting similar strategies or clearly demonstrating other places this has shown promise on a smaller scale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No attempt or misinformed attempt was made to demonstrate that the strategy is informed by nationally recognized outcomes, proven/best practices or evidenced based approaches supported by research - No attempt or misinformed attempt was made to explain why their approach should work even if it is not currently supported by research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application
4. Demonstrated to fill existing gap or an unmet need in Adams County/the region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria in Category 3 Above Average AND/OR - The proposal intends to serve a population that is historically neglected by the services that are otherwise available in our region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal intends to fill a gap in Adams County and is able to demonstrate what gap exists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The service provided would strengthen or create efficiencies within a given continuum of care but does not fill a need that either doesn't exist or is at capacity in the community (In other words, this proposal would improve the existing infrastructure for opioid abatement in the community but wouldn't outright fill a need identified through asset mapping, stakeholder and community input, or capacity analysis) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This service has not been demonstrated to fill a gap or improve upon existing efforts in a meaningful way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application

Criteria	4= Excellent	3=Above Average	2= Average	1= Unsatisfactory	NA Total Scores Will be on a scale from 1-4, based on an average of criteria scores. In the event that a criteria is not relevant to a proposal it will be removed and will not impact the average score
5. Level of collaboration with other entities in Adams County and across the region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaboration is taking place with an entity from another region such that the program is being funded with dollars from region 8 as well as dollars from a surrounding region -If not, exhaustive attempts were made to collaborate - Application demonstrates that all relevant entities have been approached in hopes of collaborating or that collaboration is actively happening - An outreach program/consistent effort is being demonstrated to find new or existing entities that could collaborate around the particular initiative in the application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing collaboration between two or more entities within the region or applicant demonstrates extensive effort has been made to collaborate with other entities - Information about the initiative is publicly available, located somewhere that is easy to find, and encourages organizations that might benefit from a partnership to approach them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant is open to collaboration and demonstrates a plan to find collaborators on the project - Applicant has approached at least one major player relevant to their application in an earnest attempt to partner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No attempt has been made to collaborate - They are not open to collaboration even if approached -Collaboration does not make sense for the proposal, but it does not articulate why 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the case where collaboration does not make sense, proposal clearly articulates why
6. Organization demonstrates a successful track record and ability to access necessary resources (such as infrastructure or workforce) for project completion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applying organization demonstrates a history of financial stability and that the proposed project is achievable with the funds awarded - Organization has successfully taken on projects of larger scope in the past - The application provides evidence that the applying organization has existing infrastructure/pipelines in place to easily access the resources necessary to complete the proposal in a cost effective manner (this includes physical infrastructure, supply chain for material goods, workforce, etc) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applying organization demonstrates a history of financial stability and that the proposed project is achievable with the funds awarded - Organization has successfully taken on projects of similar scope in the past - The application provides evidence that the applying organization can easily access the resources necessary to complete the proposal in a cost effective manner (this includes infrastructure, supply chain for material goods, workforce, etc) even if work still needs to be done to solidify access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no reason to believe that the applying organization is actively under financial duress - While there is no evidence of projects of similar scope in the organizations past, the organization is generally successful with the projects it does take on and provides evidence to substantiate this fact - The application outlines a plan by which the applying organization will access the resources necessary to complete the proposal (this includes infrastructure, supply chain for material goods, workforce, etc) even if work still needs to be done to solidify access. However, the organization may still be in the planning phase when it comes to acquiring certain assets or dealing with barriers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applying organization either does not demonstrate a history of financial stability or is actively under financial duress - Organization has not taken on any projects in the past - There is no mention of access to resources or the plan for accessing them is ill-informed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application
7. Proposed project is cost efficient and within the organizational purview (experience from historical projects can be applied to proposed one)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria in Category 3 Above Average AND - Demonstrates a robust history of similar projects or projects which require many of the constituent competencies required of the proposal - The runway (time to service) for the project is clearly outlined and we can reasonably expect to see statistically significant impact from this project before the next round of funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant demonstrates a history of similar projects or projects which require many of the constituent competencies required of the proposal - Applicant demonstrates that their proposal can be expected to have a moderate return on investment in the long run either through case studies, historical examples, or by describing, in detail, the mechanism by which they expect to see this return - The runway (time to service) for the project is clearly outlined and proposal clearly outlines when intended impact is expected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant demonstrates a brief history of comparable project(s) - If applicant does not have a history of similar projects they make a convincing and well detailed case as to why they are well equipped to engage in this work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant has no history of similar projects - No case is made as to why they are well equipped to handle this work is given - The runway (time to service) for the project is clearly outlined but doesn't illustrate when impact is expected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application
8. The extent to which other funding sources could be utilized (Braided Funding)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project is actively utilizing other funding sources including, but not limited to the infrastructure fund, State or National funding, Financing, etc. and still demonstrates a need for this funding to get across the finish line. - The applicant demonstrates an exhaustive effort of having applied to all relevant funding sources if they are not using other funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant has applied for other sources of funding but may have missed key funding streams - Applicant is willing to be referred to other funding streams to supplement funding from the regional share 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant has not explored alternative funding yet but is willing to explore options for other sources of funding in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The applicant has not explored other funding streams and is not willing to apply to them moving forward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoroughly explain why this criteria is not relevant to your application