

**Appendix E  
Level 3 Review: Proposal Scoring Criteria**

**APPLICANT NAME:**

**DESIRED COMMUNITY:**

**TIMELINE PROPOSED:**

**REVIEWER ID:**

**SUMMARY SCORES:**

	Score (max)
I. <b>Proposal Narrative and Scope of Work</b>	_____ (80)
II. <b>Qualifications Narrative</b>	_____ (80)
III. <b>Budget</b>	_____ (40)
<b><u>TOTAL SCORE:</u></b>	_____ (200)

**Note: Any notes and/or questions should be included below and on a separate piece of paper if necessary**

**I. PROPOSAL NARRATIVE, SCOPE OF WORK, LETTERS OF COMMITMENT, APPENDIX J**  
**80 points**

**RATING SCALE**

<b>A</b>	<i>Very strong</i> agreement with criteria						
<b>B</b>	<i>Strong</i> agreement with criteria						
<b>C</b>	<i>Moderate</i> agreement with criteria						
<b>D</b>	<i>Some</i> agreement with criteria						
<b>E</b>	<i>Minimal</i> agreement with criteria						
<b>F</b>	<i>No agreement or no information</i> was provided						
<b>CRITERIA</b>		<b>Circle One</b>					
		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
1.	The selected region is inclusive of communities at higher risk	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
2.	The proposed approach(es) to the project demonstrates the applicant has a clear understanding of the project	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
3.	The proposal set a foundation for an accountability plan	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
4.	The proposed approach’s project timeline is appropriate and feasible	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
5.	Letters of Commitment for each proposed Collaborative Agency were submitted and indicate understanding of proposed position in the project; the intent to fulfill that role should the proposer be selected	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
6.	The proposed Collaborating Agencies and Supporting Partners are representative of the diverse sectors that work across the EII continuum; and the proposer has certified that the Collaborative Agency meets minimum requirements	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
7.	The proposed scope of work (SOW) reflects appropriate methods to carry out the major functions	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
8.	The proposed SOW lists appropriate and feasible deliverables	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

**Score:** (maximum score = 80)

**Name of Applicant:**

**II. QUALIFICATIONS NARRATIVE AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**80 points**

**RATING SCALE**

CRITERIA	Circle One					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
<b>A</b> Applicant has <i>very strong</i> qualifications/experience in specified area						
<b>B</b> Applicant has <i>strong</i> qualifications/experience in specified area						
<b>C</b> Applicant has <i>moderate</i> qualifications/experience in specified area						
<b>D</b> Applicant has <i>some</i> qualifications/experience in specified area						
<b>E</b> Applicant has <i>minimal</i> qualifications/experience in specified area						
<b>F</b> Applicant has <i>no experience</i> or <i>no information</i> was provided for specified area						
9. Experience working with culturally and linguistically diverse groups, in particular, parents of young children and community-based programs	10	8	6	4	2	0
10. Demonstrated commitment to community and family engagement, including cultural competency, as demonstrated through past work	10	8	6	4	2	0
11. Knowledge of the ELL landscape in L.A. County, including existing referral pathways and barriers to providers and families in completing referrals.	10	8	6	4	2	0
12. At least three (3) years of experience delivering services on the ELL continuum in the proposed catchment area and obtaining funding to deliver ELL services	10	8	6	4	2	0
13. At least three (3) years of experience working within the proposed HMG-LA Pathways community catchment area and demonstrated understanding of core issues impacting ELL services in the area	10	8	6	4	2	0
14. Experience engaging in cross-sector collaboration to improve technology, infrastructure and/or practice	10	8	6	4	2	0
15. Experience convening and/or communicating with a cross-sector of service providers to implement activities, programs, etc.	10	8	6	4	2	0
16. Degree to which list of similar types of contracts that are active and/or were successfully concluded are comparable.	5	4	3	2	1	0
17. The Executive Summary presents information in a manner that is appropriate to non-experts.	5	4	3	2	1	0

**Score:** (maximum score = 80)

**Name of Applicant:**

**III. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE**

**40 points**

**RATING SCALE**

<b>A</b>	<i>Very strong</i> agreement with criteria					
<b>B</b>	<i>Strong</i> agreement with criteria					
<b>C</b>	<i>Moderate</i> agreement with criteria					
<b>D</b>	<i>Some</i> agreement with criteria					
<b>E</b>	<i>Minimal</i> agreement with criteria					
<b>F</b>	<i>No agreement or no information</i> was provided					
CRITERIA	Circle One					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
18. The costs of the proposed project activities are reasonable in view of the types and range of activities to be conducted during the project's first year.	15	12	9	6	3	0
19. The proposal provides a sufficiently detailed line item budget and budget narrative that accounts for all project activities and related costs.	15	12	9	6	3	0
20. The budget includes in-kind (e.g., staff time, services, equipment, materials, physical space, etc.) support and/or leveraging of other non-First 5 LA funds	10	8	6	4	2	0

**Score:** (maximum score = 40)

**Name of Applicant:**