

Scoring Matrix	This scoring matrix will be used to vet applications recieved between December 16, 2022- January 31, 2023 for the Adams County Opioid Abatement Grant. Some of the criteria are weighted and will impact final scores more heavily.				Rationale for Weighting
Criteria	4= Excellent	3=Above Average	2= Average	1= Unsatisfactory	
<p>1. Clearly identifies the outcome(s) the proposal is intended to impact and is tied to the Interactive Opioid Dashboard</p> <p><i>(Weight: 1)</i></p>	<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 	<p>This doesn't need additional weight as performance in this category will be penalized again when scoring category 2. In other words, if outcomes are not listed and justified, then targets and metrics won't be either.</p>
<p>2. Clear, measurable, and reasonable targets and metrics to hold accountability to impact identified</p> <p><i>(Weight: 1.5)</i></p>	<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 occuring, 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 	<p>This is weighted more heavily as it demonstrates that the applicant has been thoughtful and impact oriented in selecting a project. Considering that impact is the ultimate goal of this work, it is reasonable to give preference to applicants which have systematically thought through the impact they hope to achieve, the barriers they will face in manifesting those impacts, and how they will measure progress along the way.</p>
<p>3. Proposal has been demonstrated to be highly effective, or promising and emerging</p> <p><i>(Weight: 1.5)</i></p>	<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 	<p>This is weighted more heavily because, above all else, we want to know that investment will achieve impact. Without any kind of evidence to support a strategy, there is no reason to believe it will do so. This category is deliberately broadly defined so as not to exclude those proposals which are novel and innovative. So long as there is sound reasoning provided for a strategies effectiveness or potential effectiveness, the applicant will not be penalized; However, if none is provided or the reasoning is fallacious, it is reasonable that the applicant should be penalized more heavily.</p>
<p>4. Demonstrated to address one of the following gaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medication Assisted Treatment - Youth/Intensive Outpatient - Peer Support Systems - Workforce and Training <p><i>(Weight: 1.5)</i></p>	<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 	<p>This is weighted more heavily because we want to ensure that money is being spent efficiently and the category is broadly defined in such a way that those who don't meet it should rightfully be penalized. Put simply, if there is no demand for a service, it shouldn't be funded. Additionally, if a service fills an unmet need the application should be given an advantage over those which only fill an undermet or otherwise less urgent need. This advantage should be greater relative to the advantage gained from unweighted categories like collaboration or broadened funding because this category directly impacts the community and the wealth of resources at its disposal.</p>
<p>5. Level of collaboration with other entities in Adams County and across the region</p> <p><i>(Weight: 1)</i></p>	<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 	<p>This criteria is unweighted. We want to promote collaboration but it is reasonable to think that some entities will not have the capacity to meet the ambitious standards of this category and they should not be penalized too harshly. Additionally, this is part of RMP's role. The backbone team can help facilitate collaboration so applicants that can't demonstrate robust collaboration in their application can still be given resources necessary to do so.</p>

Scoring Matrix		This scoring matrix will be used to vet applications recieved between December 16, 2022- January 31, 2023 for the Adams County Opioid Abatement Grant. Some of the criteria are weighted and will impact final scores more heavily.			
Criteria	4= Excellent	3=Above Average	2= Average	1= Unsatisfactory	Rationale for Weighting
<p>6. Organization demonstrates a successful track record and ability to access necessary resources (such as infrastructure or workforce) for project completion</p> <p><i>(Weight: 2)</i></p>	<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 	<p>This category earned the highest singular weight of 2 due to the importance of being able to access the resources needed to ensure your project comes to fruition. In order to be successful, an organization needs to be competent and able to access the tools they need full stop. The category is defined broadly enough that there are no negative incentives or collateral damages from weighting it more heavily. For example, while weighting category 7 more heavily might inadvertently penalize novel approaches simply because the organization wouldn't have a history of comparable projects, requiring a demonstration of general organizational competency and capacity to execute the proposal would have no such adverse consequence.</p>
<p>7. Proposed project is cost efficient and within the organizational purview (experience from historical projects can be applied to proposed one)</p> <p><i>(Weight: 1)</i></p>	<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 	<p>As mentioned in the rationale for category 6, weighting this too heavily could result in penalizing proposals for simply being innovative or new. While we would like to fund organizations that meet these requirements, we don't want new approaches falling through the cracks.</p>
<p>8. The extent to which other funding sources could be utilized (Braided Funding)</p> <p><i>(Weight: 1.5)</i></p>	<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 	<p>Sustainability is of the highest importance in considering awards with these funds. It is imperative that the programs that are funded are self-sustaining moving forward and the more ways they can access funds, the better. However, much of the same reason that applies to category 5 (collaboration) still applies here. We want to strongly promote braided funding but don't want to penalize organizations that don't have the capacity to pursue other sources too strongly. This is why it has earned a 1.5 weight.</p>