

Franklin County "Opioid Settlement Application Funding"

Scoring Rubric Guidelines

This is the scoring criteria the Franklin County Opioid Committee will utilize when reviewing Opioid Settlement Funding applications. It outlines the key areas of assessment and the specific expectations for each category of scoring. By reviewing this rubric, applicants can ensure their submissions align with the evaluation process and meet the required standards for consideration.

- Lead Organization Description and Project Personnel
 - 5- Exemplary
 - Description is exceptionally clear and describes the organization's mission, structure, and experience in working with substance use disorder. Project personnel have clear roles and are qualified to complete the necessary work. There is clear evidence that the organization has the capacity to successfully implement the grant. Description is cohesive, precise, and aligns with grant goals.
 - 4-Good
 - Organization description is organized and has a clear overview of the organization's mission, structure, and experience working with substance use disorder. Project personnel have outlined roles and are qualified but are lacking some detail. Description generally supports the organization's capacity to implement the grant but may have minor gaps in clarity or detail.
 - 3-Satisfactory
 - The description is somewhat clear but lacks detail. Mission and structure are identifiable but there is limited discussion of the organization's experience in working with substance use disorder. There is a limited description of project personnel's roles and responsibilities. Though the description provides basic understanding of the organization, there are questions regarding the organization's ability to implement the grant or may lack detail about experience or project personnel.
 - 2-Needs Improvement
 - Organization description is unclear, disorganized, or incomplete. Key components including the mission, structure, or roles of

project personnel are insufficiently explained and lack detail. The organization's experience in working with substance use disorder is unclear. It is difficult to assess the organization's capacity for implementing the grant.

- 1-Poor
 - Organization description is minimal and severely lacking in detail. Important aspects of the organization, including mission, structure and past experiences are poorly explained, confusing, or missing. There is little to no evidence of the organization's ability to implement this grant.
- Project Description
 - 5-Exemplary
 - The project overview is exceptionally clear, organized, and easy to follow. Goals and objectives are clearly identified and are consistent with the overview. Project clearly aligns with the Governor's Opioid Strategic plan and is evidence based (the term "evidence-based" refers programs that are grounded in reliable, scientifically tested data) The project description directly describes how it will serve Franklin County constituents, the number of unique individuals they anticipate serving, and how the project will interface with existing organizations addressing this issue. The description is thorough, easy to follow, and lacks any significant gaps.
 - 4-Good
 - The project description is strong, clear, and directly addresses goals and objectives. Description shows alignment with the Governor's Opioid Strategic Plan and is evidence-based. The project serves Franklin County constituents and shares an expected number of people served. Project description states how it may interface with existing organizations that work to address substance use disorder. A few minor details are missing, but the project is well prepared, has clear goals, and is likely to make its intended impact.
 - 3-Satisfactory
 - The project description is organized and addresses general goals of the grant. Goals and objectives are logical and generally explained, but some areas need more detail to make a clear connection to the expected impact. The project description

shows alignment with the Governor's Opioid Strategic Plan. Project clearly plans to serve Franklin County, but it is unclear how many individuals they plan to serve. Project description states that it will interact with existing organizations but is lacking detail. The project appears feasible, but there are areas that could benefit from further refinement.

- 2-Needs Improvement
 - The project description is somewhat clear but is very general or inconsistent. Some goals and objectives are outlined but lack details or clear ties to the project. Project description does not clearly align with the Governor's Opioid Strategic Plan. The project does not indicate a clear focus on Franklin County or how many people it expects to serve. Project does not have any detailed plans on interacting with other organizations. The project has potential but lacks necessary detail and structure.
- 1-Poor
 - Project description is vague, disorganized, or hard to understand. Goals and objectives are not clearly defined or are missing. Project does not indicate any alignment with the Governor's Opioid Strategic Plan. The project description does not suggest that it will serve Franklin County or interact with any other organizations. The project is not likely to be successful due to significant issues in planning, clarity, or alignment with grant goals.
- Priority Population and Geographic Area
 - 5-Exemplary
 - Priority population and geographic area served is well defined with a comprehensive description of key demographics, needs, and the populations' key challenges. The description includes community demographics and local resources or gaps. The priority population and geographic area clearly align with the project description, organization, and goals of the grant.
 - 4-Good
 - Priority population and geographic area served are clearly defined and there is clear justification for the need. The priority population and geographic area align with the project description, organization, and goals of the grant
 - 3-Satisfactory

- Priority population and geographic area served are defined and described, including demographics and needs related to substance use disorder. Description demonstrates a general understanding of the population and geographic area has gaps in detail or research.
 - 2-Needs Improvement
 - Priority population and geographic area served are defined but lack sufficient detail or specificity. There is limited evidence that the proposed population or area needs the proposed project.
 - 1-Poor
 - Priority population and geographic area served are not clearly defined, are poorly described, or missing from the document. There is no evidence the proposed project will reach or engage with the intended population or geographic area.
- Project Timeline
 - 5-Exemplary
 - The timeline is comprehensive, feasible, and well structured. All major activities, milestones, and deadlines are included in logical sequencing. The timeline demonstrates a deep understanding of the time needed to complete each task and how the project will progress throughout the funding period. The timeline is detailed, achievable, and logical, without any significant issues or gaps.
 - 4-Good
 - The timeline is detailed, well organized, and displays clear, logical milestones. Major activities are appropriately spaced out and timeline displays and understanding of the time needed to complete each task. There may be potential for slight adjustment in sequencing or timing, but the timeline is feasible.
 - 3-Satisfactory
 - The project timeline is clear and outlines the main activities and milestones for the project. Deadlines are included, but some activities lack adequate time frames, detail, or are unrealistic. Timeline is mostly feasible but could use refinement.
 - 2-Needs Improvement
 - Project timeline is defined but lacks sufficient detail and clarity. Some key activities and milestones are listed but are incomplete or poorly defined. Timeline lacks specificity in terms of dates and responsibilities and may be unrealistic.

- 1-Poor
 - The timeline is missing, unclear, or vague. There is no clear schedule for major activities, milestones, or deadlines. It is difficult to understand how this project will progress or be completed.
- Scope of Work
 - 5-Exemplary
 - The scope of work is comprehensive, detailed, and fully aligned with the project's goals and objectives. All tasks, activities, and deliverables are clearly outlined, and each step is carefully thought out to ensure the project reaches its goals. All activities are listed and include clear and feasible outputs, outcomes, and an expected timeline. The scope of work provides a clear, actionable plan for achieving the project objectives with properly allocated resources and a logical timeline.
 - 4-Good
 - The scope of work is detailed, well-organized, and directly aligned with the project's goals. The major tasks, activities, and deliverables are clearly defined, and the timeline and responsible parties are specified. All activities, outputs, outcomes, and timelines are included, but may require minor adjustments or additions. There is a clear link between each task and its intended outcomes, and the scope of work demonstrates a practical and achievable plan.
 - 3-Satisfactory
 - The scope of work is clearly defined and outlines the major activities, tasks, and responsibilities necessary to achieve the project's goals. There is a reasonable level of detail, though some areas could benefit from additional explanation or specificity. The activities are logically connected to the project's objectives. There may be minor gaps in detail or areas that need further refinement. The roles and responsibilities of staff or stakeholders may be somewhat unclear or need more structure.
 - 2-Needs Improvement
 - The scope of work includes some key activities and tasks but lacks sufficient detail or clarity in many areas. Some parts of the scope may be vague or not fully aligned with the project's objectives. There is a basic description of what will be done, but

some important steps are missing or underdeveloped. The scope describes broad activities but lacks specificity regarding timeline, outputs, and outcomes. There may be gaps in the description of activities, leading to uncertainty about how the objectives will be met.

- 1-Poor
 - The scope of work is unclear, vague, or incomplete. Major activities, tasks, or deliverables are missing or poorly described. There is little to no connection between the tasks and the project's goals, and the project's objectives are not adequately supported by the outlined activities. Activities outlined are unrealistic or unfeasible given the project's resources or timeline.
- Sustainability
 - 5-Exemplary
 - The sustainability plan is comprehensive, realistic, and well-integrated into the overall project design. The proposal outlines a clear plan for maintaining the project's activities and impact after the grant ends, including securing future funding, building partnerships, and embedding the project in existing community structures or systems. The strategies are well-supported by data, research, and past success stories. The sustainability plan thoroughly addresses long term financial and operational sustainability with detailed steps, backup plans, and well-defined metrics for success.
 - 4-Good
 - The sustainability plan is well developed and includes clear, feasible strategies for maintaining the project's activities and impact after the grant ends. The proposal includes specific actions, such as additional funding, forming partnerships, or embedding project activities into local systems or organizations. There may be some minor concerns or areas where the plan could be further refined, but the sustainability plan is realistic, grounded in evidence, and demonstrates a strong commitment to long term success.
 - 3-Satisfactory
 - The sustainability plan includes reasonable strategies for maintaining the project's impact beyond the grant period. The proposal outlines specific steps, such as securing future funding,

establishing partnerships, or integrating project activities into existing systems. The plan is generally feasible but is missing detail or relies on assumptions about future funding that may be difficult to implement. The proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of sustainability, but the strategies could be better defined or supported

- 2-Needs Improvement
 - The sustainability plan is outlined but lacks sufficient detail or feasibility. Some strategies for long-term sustainability are mentioned, but they are not clearly defined or heavily rely on assumptions for future funding. The plan lacks concrete steps to maintain the projects activities or impact after initial funding. There is some understanding of the need for sustainability, but the plan is not fully developed or realistic.
- 1-Poor
 - The sustainability plan is either missing or poorly developed. There is no clear strategy for continuing the project's activities, funding, or impact after the grant ends. The proposal does not address how the project will maintain activities or continue to make impact after initial funding. There is little to no mention of sustainability, or the plan is overly vague, unrealistic, or impractical.
- Budget
 - 5-Exemplary
 - The budget is comprehensive, well-organized, and fully aligned with the project's goals, activities, and timeline. Every category of expense is clearly explained and justified, with a detailed breakdown of costs. The budget is realistic, feasible, and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the resources needed to successfully implement the project. The proposed budget ensures the project can be completed as planned, and costs are reasonable and well-distributed.
 - 4-Good
 - Budget is clear, detailed, and aligned with the project's activities and goals. The proposed costs are realistic and well-justified, with a clear breakdown of how funds will be allocated across categories (e.g., personnel, supplies, equipment, etc). The budget is mostly feasible, and all major expenses are accounted

for. There may be adjustments needed for specific line items or additional clarification for certain expenses.

- 3-Satisfactory
 - The budget is mostly clear and detailed, with a reasonable breakdown of expenses aligned with the project's goals and activities. The categories of costs are generally appropriate, and the proposed costs are mostly realistic. However, there may be minor concerns with certain costs or allocations that require further explanation. Budget includes most of the necessary components, but there are minor gaps or unclear justifications for specific expenses. It is generally realistic but would benefit from additional detail and clarification.
- 2-Needs Improvement
 - The budget includes basic categories of expenses, but it lacks sufficient detail or clarity. Some categories may be vague or incomplete, and the costs listed may not fully align with the project activities. The budget may be somewhat realistic, but there are concerns regarding feasibility or proper allocation. While the budget includes some appropriate categories, it lacks sufficient detail in how funds will be allocated to specific tasks. Some costs may appear unreasonable, or there may be missing costs that are essential to the project.
- 1-Poor
 - The budget is incomplete, unclear, or not aligned with the project's goals and activities. Essential costs are missing, and there is no clear breakdown of expenses. The budget does not appear feasible or realistic based on the project scope, timeline, or objectives. The budget does not provide enough information for the reviewer to assess how funds will be used, some critical components of the project are not accounted for, or proposed costs are unrealistic.