

DCF EXAMPLE #1
Benchmarks for Evaluation Committee

ABOUT: In the example below, each section is assigned a total “possible points” and evaluators must provide and defend a score using the rubric noted below.

INSTRUCTIONS:

- Please write the benchmarks so that they are as quantifiable for performance as possible and relevant to the section being scored.
- Write the benchmarks in the “Excellent”, “Very Good”, “Good/Fair” and “Poor” sections so that an evaluator understands the program needs and can defend the score, if needed and allow the evaluation committee to differentiate a satisfactory proposal response from an excellent response.
- Assign point values in the rating scale.

Section 1.1 Organizational Structure		Rating Scale	Possible Points
A. Include the mission of your organization as well as a description of current services by your agency and method of providing services. B. Describe the nature, size, and scope of your organization’s current service provision. C. Describe your history of managing contracts/subcontracts similar in size and scope to this proposal and provide evidence of established methods to effectively coordinate, oversee, and manage such contracts. D. Explain how your organizational structure promotes flexibility, accountability and responsiveness to consumers/clients.		Excellent: 8-10 Very Good: 6-7 Good/Fair: 3-5 Poor: 3 or below	10
Benchmarks			
<u>Excellent</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. Agency has mission and description of current services; these are of the type and capacity that will complement comprehensive and high-quality provision of services. Nature, size, and scope of agency’s service provision is sufficient to effectively administer a program. Agency has experience managing programs of similar size and scope (cross systems/counties; youth, community and stakeholder engagement; grant funded) effectively. The organization demonstrates the flexibility, accountability and responsiveness to clients needed for operating a regional program. The organization has been recognized or positively evaluated by an outside source. 	<u>Very Good</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. Agency has mission and description of current services; however, one or both are not of the type and capacity that will complement and direct comprehensive and high-quality provision of services. Agency has experience managing programs effectively and nature of its work aligns with the services requested; however, the size and/or scope of services are not representative of the services requested. Agency’s structure promotes flexibility, accountability, and responsiveness to clients OR a clear description of how the program will be managed to account for any weakness in this area is provided. Agency has been recognized or positively evaluated by an outside source. 	<u>Good/Fair</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. Agency does not have established mission and lacks sufficient description of current services OR mission and detailed services are not of the type and capacity that will complement and direct comprehensive and high-quality provision of services. Nature of agency’s service provision is largely unaligned with requirements of administering services. Agency has experience with management of contracts or subcontracts; however, the size and scope of services are not comparable to the scope of services requested. Agency structure promotes little or no flexibility, accountability, and responsiveness to clients and no description is provided to account for weaknesses in this area. 	<u>Poor</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency failed to respond to all of the questions. Responses are unclear and lack depth Nature, size, and scope of agency’s service provision is unaligned with and would minimally contribute to service provision. Services are not comparable to the scope of services requested. Agency does not demonstrate the flexibility, accountability, and responsiveness to clients needed to successfully operate a Regional Program.

Section 1.2 Program Experience			Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Describe your organization’s approach to working with adolescents.</p> <p>B. Describe your organization’s experience working with young people, including services in the areas of: employment, education, housing, health, finances, mentoring, and supportive services; include a success story.</p> <p>C. Describe your organization’s experience working with young adults from diverse backgrounds across a wide range of service needs (including Mental Health, AODA, teen parents, etc.).</p>			<p>Excellent: 16-20 Very Good: 10-15 Good/Fair: 5-9 Poor: 4 or below</p>	20
Benchmarks				
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency describes an approach to working with adolescents that demonstrates knowledge of adolescent development and effective engagement strategies. The agency has experience directly providing, or connecting youth and/or young adults to, a variety of services that are representative of the services required to successfully run the regional program. The response also demonstrates experience engaging youth and/or young adults from diverse backgrounds through various forms of media. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency describes an approach to working with adolescents that demonstrates knowledge of adolescent development and effective engagement strategies. The agency has experience directly providing, or connecting youth and/or young adults to, some services that are representative of the services required to successfully run the regional program. Agency has some experience working with youth/young adults from diverse backgrounds and different forms of media. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. The agency demonstrates an understanding of adolescent development but does not identify effective engagement strategies. The agency has minimal to no experience engaging youth and/or young adults from diverse backgrounds through various forms of media; however, a plan for doing so has been provided. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency failed to respond to all of the questions. Responses are unclear and lack depth, or do not demonstrate the experience needed to successfully operate a Regional Program. 	

Section 1.3 Capacity Building and Partnership			Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Describe your organization’s role in community collaborations as evidenced by existing neighborhood-based programs or activities in which your agency has a role or partnership within the Region, including but not limited to: schools, law enforcement, neighborhood centers, civic groups, housing, volunteer organizations, church communities, county and tribal child welfare, adult services, and community associations that benefit children and families.</p> <p>B. Provide a minimum of two, but no more than three, letters of support from collaborative partners.</p>			<p>Excellent: 20-25 Very Good: 12-19 Good/Fair: 4-11 Poor: 3 or below</p>	25
Benchmarks				
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency has extensive connections in the service area represented in the region and demonstrates effective partnerships with a variety of stakeholders, including, but not limited to, tribal and county child welfare, and other community organizations that benefit youth and families. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency has several connections in the service area represented in the region and speaks about partnering with a variety of stakeholders, including, but not limited to, tribal and county child welfare, and other community organizations that benefit youth and families. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. The agency has minimal connection to providers in the service area represented in the region; however, has a plan for increasing partnership with others, including tribal and county child welfare, and youth justice agencies. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency failed to respond to all of the questions. Responses are unclear and lack depth, or do not demonstrate the partnerships needed for successfully operating a Regional Program. 	

Section 1.4 Program Description	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Describe the vision for the proposed program, and how the proposed program will fit into your agency’s existing structure and meet the specified requirements and outcomes within this RFP.</p> <p>B. Describe in detail how your organization will build a pro-youth public/private network of services, providers, and supports to meet the needs of youth living throughout the region. Include the following components, highlighting any current and planned partnerships that will build capacity for broad service availability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the agency will provide the following direct services: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Participate and collaborate in transition meetings for any eligible youth who currently resides in or moves into and becomes a permanent resident of the region. ii. Facilitate youth connections to local resources and services. iii. Support the youth’s own efforts to become self-sufficient; provide flexible assistance in the manner requested by the youth, to meet the youth’s goals and needs. iv. Provide initial and ongoing assessment of the youth’s abilities, needs, goals, and milestones; adjust goals and services as needed. v. Assist youth in identifying and maintaining connections to life-long caring adults. vi. Develop rapport and keep youth engaged through various mediums such as direct contact, a website, social media, youth councils, and support groups. 2. How the agency will provide programming that is evidence-informed, culturally responsible, and rooted in positive youth development. 	<p>Excellent: 50-60 Very Good: 30-49 Good/Fair: 10-29 Poor: 10 or below</p>	<p>60</p>

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information requested is clearly provided. • A description for creating a regional network, partnering with OHC agencies, providing direct services and youth leadership opportunities is thoroughly outlined in the proposal. • The agency identified evidence-informed programming and indicated a plan/mechanisms for ensuring that practice is culturally responsible and draws from a positive youth development framework. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information requested is provided. • A description for creating a regional network, partnering with OHC agencies, providing direct services and youth leadership opportunities is outlined in the proposal; some gaps may exist. • The agency referenced evidence-informed programming, culturally responsible practice and positive youth development; however, how these things would be part of the program was unclear. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most information requested is provided. • The description for creating a regional network, partnering with OHC agencies, providing direct services and youth leadership opportunities is outlined in the proposal but is unclear, unrealistic, or several gaps exist. • The agency referenced evidence-informed programming, culturally responsible practice and/or positive youth development; however, how these things would be part of the program was unclear. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency failed to respond to all of the questions. Responses are unclear and lack depth, or do not demonstrate the agency’s capacity to create a regional network, effectively partner with OHC agencies, or provide direct services and/or youth leadership opportunities in ways that are needed to successfully operate a Regional Program.

Section 1.5 Timetable	Rating Scale	Possible Points	
<p>Provide a timetable (submit as Attachment G) reflective of the start-up timeline for implementation including hiring, development of partnerships and stakeholder meetings, staff training, communication with partners, outreach to eligible youth, collaboration with county and tribal CW agencies and any other milestones.</p>	<p>Excellent: 8-10 Very Good: 6-7 Good/Fair: 3-5 Poor: 3 or below</p>	<p>10</p>	
Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information requested is clearly provided in a way that demonstrates an understanding of the scope of the program and necessary partnerships. • The timeline is realistic. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information requested is provided in a way demonstrates an understanding of the scope of the program and most of the necessary partnerships. • The timeline is fairly realistic. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is only partially provided, is unclear, or lacks depth. The agency demonstrates limited understanding of the scope of the program and/or necessary partnerships. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency failed to respond to all of the questions, responses are unclear, lack depth and do not demonstrate an understanding of the scope of the program and necessary partnerships.

Section 1.6 Program Evaluation		Rating Scale	Possible Points
A. Describe your agency's process for quality assurance, program evaluation, outcome-based management, and use of information systems for these purposes. B. Describe your agency's methods of making prompt changes when needed to improve effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery. C. Describe other evaluation procedures or methods to be used for client feedback on the program.		Excellent: 20-25 Very Good: 12-19 Good/Fair: 4-11 Poor: 3 or below	25
Benchmarks			
<u>Excellent</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. Agency has extensive experience establishing outcomes, evaluating programs and ensuring quality through the use of information systems. Response indicates the agency is nimble and able to make changes relatively quickly to improve service delivery. 	<u>Very Good</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. Agency has some experience establishing outcomes, evaluating programs and ensuring quality through the use of information systems. Response indicates the agency is able to make minor changes to improve service delivery. 	<u>Good/Fair</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Agency has minimal experience establishing outcomes, evaluating programs and ensuring quality through the use of information systems. Response indicates barriers to making changes to improve service delivery. 	<u>Poor</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency failed to respond to all of the questions, responses are unclear, lack depth and/or do not demonstrate experience establishing outcomes, evaluating programs and ensuring quality through the use of information systems. Response indicates barriers to making changes to improve service delivery.