

ATTACHMENT VII
SUMMARY RATING SHEETS

PROPOSER _____

COUNTY(IES) TO BE SERVED _____

A. DEMONSTRATED ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY (25 POINTS) **A.** _____

B. APPROPRIATENESS AND QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM (20 POINTS) **B.** _____

C. REASONABLENESS OF COST (15 POINTS) **C.** _____

A minimum score of 40 is required for bid acceptance.

EVALUATOR: (Print) _____

(Signature) _____

DATE: ____/____/____

DETAIL RATING SHEETS

PROPOSER _____

REVIEWER _____

COUNTY(IES) TO BE SERVED _____

A. DEMONSTRATED ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY (23 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer has demonstrated that the provision of CASA services to the family court in the designated county fits within its mission. (4 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source of information: Question 1]

2-4 points: Proposer demonstrates a clear link between the agency’s mission and the provision of CASA services to the family court in the designated county.

0-1 points: Proposer fails to demonstrate an appropriate mission fit in the designated county.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

2. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer has demonstrated strategic planning and resource development planning to support the CASA program in the county specified. (3 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Questions 2 and 3, Appendix D.]

- 2-3 points: Proposer demonstrates that:
- It has a current and thorough strategic plan that allows for the maintenance and development of the CASA program in the specified county
 - It has a current and thorough resource development plan that provides for sufficient resources to support program services in the specified county

0-1 points: Proposer has failed to meet some or all of the above criteria.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

3. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer has demonstrated it has the administrative and technological structure to support a CASA program in the specified county. (7 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Questions 4, 5 and 9, Appendix D.]

4-7 points: The proposal contains a detailed description of appropriate facilities, technology and administrative structure available to support the provision of CASA services in the designated county.

2-3 points: The proposal contains an adequate description of facilities, technology and administrative structure that in some ways would insufficiently support the provision of CASA services in the designated county.

0-1 points: The proposal contains an inadequate description of facilities, technology and administrative structure available to support the provision of CASA services in the designated county and what is described will provide insufficient support for the provision of CASA services in the designated county.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

4. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer demonstrates local support for its administration of a CASA program in the designated county, and a proven track record of working collaboratively with local entities. (4 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Question 7; Appendix E, Letters of Support]

3-4 points: Proposer's letters of support and participation in partnership efforts indicate the ability to work collaboratively with child welfare stakeholders in the designated county to positively impact the lives of children and families.

2 points: Proposer's letters of support and participation in partnership efforts somewhat indicate the ability to work collaboratively with child welfare stakeholders in the designated county to positively impact the lives of children and families.

0-1 points: Proposer fails to sufficiently demonstrate support from stakeholders in the designated county and fails to show

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

5. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer’s Board of Directors and Advisory Board (if applicable) are actively engaged in the oversight and success of the organization. (CASA Programs housed in multi-purpose agencies are required by court rule to have an Advisory Committee.) (5 points).

[Reviewer: Consider the following source of information: Questions 14 & 15; Appendix D.]

3-5 points: Agency’s governing board meets all of the following criteria:

- Board of Directors meets at least six times per year and a quorum of a simple majority is present
- Advisory Committee, if applicable, meets at least four times per year with a simple majority of its members present
- All board members contribute financially to the organization
- Board has an effective mechanism to regularly evaluate the performance of the Executive Director or Chief Executive Officer
- Board has an effective mechanism to monitor the operation and quality of CASA program services in the designated county

2 points: Agency’s governing board fails to meet at least two of the above criteria.

0-1 points: Agency’s governing board fails to meet at least three of the above criteria.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

6. Evaluate the proposer’s description of the agency’s internal controls procedure and fiscal oversight of the CASA program. (2 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Questions B3 and B5.]

2 points Proposer demonstrates that:

- Internal controls procedures are in place and adequately described
- Board review, approval and monitoring of the budget takes place throughout the year
- The CASA program director is involved in the creation and monitoring of the program budget.

1 point Proposer fails to meet at least one of the above criteria

0 points Proposer fails to meet at least two of the above criteria

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

SUBTOTAL FOR PART “A”: (A1 + A2 + A3 + A4 + A4 +A6) _____
--

B: APPROPRIATENESS AND QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM (20 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the program will engage in sufficient evaluative strategies to maintain quality control. (4 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source of information: Question 6.]

3-4 points Proposer demonstrates a comprehensive plan likely to adequately measure the CASA program’s effectiveness

1-2 points Proposer demonstrates a somewhat adequate plan to measure the CASA program’s effectiveness

0 points Proposer demonstrates insufficient measures of effectiveness.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

2. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates mechanisms to protect confidentiality. (2 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source of information: Question 8.]

1-2 points Proposer adequately describes mechanisms that will ensure the confidentiality of documents and files

0 points Proposer fails to describe confidentiality procedures and/or those procedures would not ensure confidentiality.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

3. Evaluate the program’s status regarding affiliation with National CASA. (4 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Questions 16 and 17.]

2-4 points Proposer demonstrates either (a) current affiliation with National CASA as a local CASA program with no noted areas of improvement; (b) a sufficient plan to correct any improvements noted on a NCASA self-assessment within the past two years; or (c) an adequate plan to achieve National CASA status. **OR**, if proposer seeks to provide advocacy for children in family court child welfare cases that differs from the National CASA model, proposer has sufficiently detailed the scope and rationale for those services.

0-1 points Proposer has failed to meet any of the above criteria to a sufficient degree.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating:

4. Evaluate the process by which the program will effectively provide culturally competent child advocacy services to the family court in the designated county. (10 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Questions 11, 12 and 13.]

7-10 points Proposer demonstrates both a comprehensive plan to recruit, train, utilize and develop a volunteer corps to provide adequate CASA services to family court and a plan to retain and maintain a diverse and culturally competent volunteer corps to provide services to the family court in the designated county. **OR**, if proposer seeks to provide advocacy for children in family court child welfare cases that differs from the National CASA volunteer model, proposer demonstrates a comprehensive plan to provide culturally competent services to the family court in the designated county.

3-6 points Proposer demonstrates a plan that fails in some ways to provide adequate recruitment, training or supervisory mechanisms, sufficient CASA services and/or to promote diversity and cultural competence. **OR**, if proposer seeks to provide advocacy for children in family court child welfare cases that differs from the National CASA volunteer model, proposer’s plan fails in some ways to ensure the provision of culturally competent services to the family court in the designated county.

0-2 points Proposer fails to demonstrate a sufficient plan for volunteer recruitment, training and supervision and/or an insufficient mechanism for development a culturally diverse and competent volunteer pool. **OR**, if proposer seeks to provide advocacy for children in family court child welfare cases that differs from the National CASA volunteer model, proposer’s plan fails to ensure the provision of culturally competent services to the family court in the designated county.

RATING_____

Basis for Rating:

SUBTOTAL FOR PART “B”: (B1 + B2 + B3 + B4) _____

C. REASONABLENESS OF COST (15 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposed program will effectively utilize state dollars for the delivery of quality services. (8 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following sources of information: Question B1 and Appendix C.]

6-8 points Proposer demonstrates reasonable and appropriate costs for staff salaries, fringe and non-personal services to manage the CASA program, and utilizes state dollars effectively for the proposed services. Reasonable and appropriate costs are neither too high nor too low for the geographic area and comparable agencies.

3-5 points Proposer demonstrates somewhat reasonable and appropriate costs for staff salaries, fringe and non-personal services to manage the CASA program, and somewhat effective use of state dollars for proposed services.

0-2 points Proposer demonstrates costs for staff salaries, fringe and non-personal services to manage the CASA program that are not reasonable or appropriate, and ineffective use of state dollars for the proposed services.

RATING_____

Basis for Rating:

2. Evaluate the extent to which the percentage of UCS funds that support administrative costs (including salaries and fringe benefits of non-program staff, real estate expenses that are not utilized for the direct delivery of services, and related costs) is reasonable and sufficiently justified. (2 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source of information: Question B2.]

- 2 points Administrative costs are appropriate and provide for sufficient agency administration of the program.
- 1 points. Some administrative costs are either too high or too low to provide for reasonable administration of the program, or are insufficiently justified.
- 0 points Administrative costs are unreasonable and/or not justified.

RATING_____

Basis for Rating:

3. Evaluate the proposer’s ability to supplement UCS funding with a diverse blend of additional resources to serve the county in question. (5 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source of information: Question B4.]

- 4-5 points Proposer details a realistic, sufficient and diverse funding base to supplement UCS funding for the CASA program in the designated county.
- 2-3 points Proposer provides a less than adequate supplemental funding base, or a lack of diversity among supplemental funding options in the designated county.
- 0-1 points Proposer either provides no supplemental funding support for the CASA program or an amount insufficient to maintain the program in the designated county.

RATING_____

Basis for Rating:

SUBTOTAL FOR PART “C”: (C1 + C2 + C3) _____
--