

Program Name:

Submitting Organization:	
ROMA Individual and Family Domain	(check one):
 1. Employment 2. Education and Cognitive Development 3. Income and Asset Building 4. Housing 	 5. Health and Social/Behavioral Development 6. Civic Engagement and Community Involvement 7. Infrastructure and Asset Building
General Feedback	Written Comments
What strengths did I see in this program?	
What opportunities did I see for improvement?	
What advice or coaching can I offer?	



	Programs using the guidelines:	seven content areas are detaileThe maximum possiblFor any "GOOD/MOI	 ghest and lowest possible scores awarded within each of the following ren content areas are detailed below in the rubric. The maximum possible project score is 100 pts. For any "GOOD/MODERATE" rating or below, please provide written comments to support your rating. 	
TOTAI	L SCORE:			
	<u>Co</u>	ntent Area	Reviewer Comments	
	1. <u>History</u> (0 poin	ts)		
	2. Previous Reco	gnition (0 points)		
Reviewer Score	(3) Problem or Need (_		
	community that led this program. Provide the local, so background inform context of the state Please document the any data, evidence the problem or need to the community of the state. Scoring Criteria 15 = EXCELLENT Description of specific addresses why resoluted include the consequence status quo. Data, evidence provided to confirm the state quo. Data, evidence provided to confirm the state quo. Description of problem importance is not explain evidence or an assessmit problem or need. O = INCOMPLETE Description is confusint demonstrated. Background information is confusint demonstrated. Background information is confusint demonstrated.	problem or need is complete, on of issue is important, may es and costs for continuing the nee, or an assessment is a problem or need. TE is understandable, but its ined thoroughly and/or data, ent do not clearly confirm the		
		nissing. Data, evidence, or , or do not demonstrate or need.		



Reviewer	(4) Analysis of Options (0-15 pts.)	
Score	 Who is the target population served? Please describe the options the CAA considered for solving the problem/addressing this need. How did the agency arrive at this program as a solution? What evidence led you to this as the best solution? How does the solution correlate with the agency's mission? Who participated in the program creation? 	
	Scoring Criteria	
	15 = EXCELLENT Identifies target audience and provides evidence leading to this program as a solution to the stated need. May include evidence of looking at several solutions to resolve the situation, including criteria for choosing the best solution. Shows analysis of how the program correlates with the agency's mission. Program includes innovative or creative aspects that are described in the application. May provide evidence that the agency addressed capacity and sources for funding and staffing.	
	7 = GOOD/MODERATE Identifies target audience, but evidence of exploring solutions is scant, confusing or unclear. Analysis of how the program correlates with agency mission is superficial. No mention of innovative or creative aspects of the program; no evidence that the agency addressed capacity and sources for funding and staffing.	
	 0 = INCOMPLETE Target audience not identified. No evidence of exploring alternative solutions. No analysis of how the program correlates with agency mission. No mention of innovative or creative aspects of the program; no evidence that the agency addressed capacity and sources for funding and staffing 	



Reviewer Score	(5) Program Development and Implementation (0-20 pts.)	
	 What specific goals were developed as part of the program planning? 	
	 Describe how the program works or operates. What are the important processes or steps? 	
	What makes this program innovative?	
	 What quality control processes do you have in place to ensure/verify the program is operating as intended? 	
	 What resources, collaborations, staff, technology, etc., were required for the success of this program? 	
	Scoring Criteria	
	20 = EXCELLENT Vision and goals were developed and are clearly stated in application; application includes a clear and thorough description of how the program was developed and implemented and actions are consistent with vision and goals. Including: # of staff, volunteers, if any, needed to implement the program and their roles and responsibilities. Description of development/ implementation resources needed; description of any new technology used; explanation of any collaboration (who, how, why); may include timelines and benchmarks for implementation; quality control measures are in place for program evaluation.	
	10 = GOOD/MODERATE Not clear if program vision and goals were developed, or the stated vision and goals are confusing; description of how the program was developed is scant, unclear, or confusing; actions do not align well with any stated vision and/or goals or are only somewhat consistent with stated vision and/or goals; application does not include a thorough description of # of staff, volunteers, if any, and their roles and responsibilities; description of development/ implementation resources needed; description of any new technology used; explanation of any collaboration (who, how, why); limited evidence that quality controls are in place for program evaluation;	



	timelines and benchmarks for implementation not	
	included; some evidence of "must dos" and "don't	
	ever do" presented for reference by others.	
	0. 11/00/10/10/10	
	0 = INCOMPLETE	
	No stated program vision and goals; description of	
	how the program was developed is missing or	
	incomplete; actions do not align with any stated	
	vision and/or goals; application does not include a	
	description of number of staff, volunteers, if any,	
	needed to implement the program and their roles and	
	responsibilities; description of development/	
	implementation resources needed; description of any	
	new technology used; explanation of any	
	collaboration (who, how, why); no evidence that	
	quality controls are in place for program evaluation.	
Reviewer	(6) Program Strengths (0-10 pts)	
Score		
	• What are the best attributes of this program?	
	• What would you change?	
	William Would you change.	
	Scoring Criteria	
	S .	
	10=EXCELLENT	
	Thorough, candid, and reflective evaluation of	
	program strengths or attributes; reflective analysis of	
	the program's strengths versus weaknesses/	
	limitations; constructive recommendations for	
	program improvement provided.	
	5=GOOD/MODERATE	
	Incomplete or superficial evaluation of program	
	strengths or attributes; analysis of program strengths	
	versus weaknesses/ limitations is overly generalized	
	or superficial; limited, unclear or confusing	
	recommendations for program improvements	
	6 WG 014D1 FFF	
	0=INCOMPLETE	
	No evaluation of program strengths or attributes.	
		1
	Analysis of program strengths versus weaknesses/	
	Analysis of program strengths versus weaknesses/ limitations is missing; no recommendations for	



project can be sustained.

Reviewer	(7) Program Outcomes (0-30 pts.)	
Score		
	Based on the ROMA category in which this program	
	is nominated:	
	• What are the outcomes of this program?	
	 Document how the program measurably improves the lives of low-income people. Describe outcomes numerically, if possible. Provide any measures demonstrating efficiency and effectiveness. 	
	Scoring Criteria	
	<i>30= EXCELLENT</i>	
	Demonstrated actual measurable ROI/Results; uses	
	actual figures to indicate savings and/or revenue,	
	including specific calculations and/or formulas used to get numbers; provides concrete data for measures;	
	displays data in compelling format; provides evidence	
	that the project fulfilled (or not) its intended	
	measurement goals; the program represents a	
	significant benefit to the agency, the CAA system, or	
	the community; evidence suggests that the program is	
	sustainable	
	20= GOOD/MODERATE	
	Demonstrated <i>potential</i> ROI/Results; provides	
	projected or probable figures to indicate savings	
	and/or revenue, including calculations and/or	
	formulas used to get numbers; provides some data for	
	measures; missed opportunity to display data in	
	compelling format; attempts to provide evidence that	
	the project fulfilled (or not) its intended measurement	
	goals; limited evidence to suggest that the program is a significant benefit to the agency,	
	CAA system, or community; some evidence to suggest	
	that project may be sustainable.	
	0 = INCOMPLETE	
	Did not demonstrate a potential for measurable	
	ROI/Results; does not provide any data; fails to	
	provides evidence that the program fulfilled (or not) its intended measurement goals; no evidence to suggest	
	that the program is a significant benefit to the agency,	
	CAA system or community no evidence that the	



Reviewer	(8) Future Development for the Program
Score	(0-10 pts.)
	• What have you learned from implementing this program?
	What advice or recommendations would you have for others considering your program?
	Scoring Criteria
	Scoring Criteria
	10 = EXCELLENT
	Includes a thorough, candid and reflective evaluation of the program results/benefits outside of the actual measurements; sets out clear advice or recommendations for others considering a similar program; demonstrates exemplary program
	5 = GOOD/MODERATE Incomplete or superficial evaluation of the program results/benefits outside of the actual measurements; program results and conclusions are overly generalized or accomplishments are overstated; unclear or confusing advice or recommendations for others considering a similar program; demonstrates emerging or promising program
	0 = INCOMPLETE No evaluation of the program results/benefits outside of the actual measurements; program results and conclusions are insufficient and no evidence is provided on whether the program me or failed to meet goals; no constructive advice or recommendations for others considering a similar program; does not demonstrate a best, emerging or promising program