

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ROMA Individual and Family Domain (check one):**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 1. Employment<br><input type="radio"/> 2. Education and Cognitive Development<br><input type="radio"/> 3. Income and Asset Building<br><input type="radio"/> 4. Housing | <input type="radio"/> 5. Health and Social/Behavioral Development<br><input type="radio"/> 6. Civic Engagement and Community Involvement |
|---|--|

<u>General Feedback</u>	<u>Written Comments</u>
What strengths did I see in this program?	
What opportunities did I see for improvement?	
What advice or coaching can I offer?	
<b>Evaluate Programs using the following guidelines:</b>	Highest and lowest possible scores awarded within each of the following seven content areas are detailed below in the rubric. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maximum possible project score is 100 pts.</li> <li>For any “GOOD/MODERATE” rating or below, please provide written comments to support your rating.</li> </ul>

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Score</u>	<u>Content Area</u>	<u>Comments</u>
0	<p><b><u>History</u></b> (0 points)</p> <p><b><u>Previous Recognition</u></b> (0 points)</p>	
	<p><b><u>(1) Problem or Need</u></b> (0-20 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please describe the problem or need in your community that led the CAA to offer or develop this program.</li> <li>• Provide the local, social, political, or economic background information needed to understand the context of the stated need or problem.</li> <li>• Please document the need that existed by showing any data, evidence or assessment that confirms the problem or need. Quantifying the need helps substantiate the nomination.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring Criteria</b></p> <p><i>20 = EXCELLENT</i> Description of specific problem or need is complete, addresses why resolution of issue is important, may include the consequences and costs for continuing the status quo. Data, evidence, or an assessment is provided to confirm the problem or need.</p> <p><i>10 = GOOD/MODERATE</i> Description of problem is understandable, but its importance is not explained thoroughly and/or data, evidence or an assessment do not clearly confirm the problem or need.</p> <p><i>0 = INCOMPLETE</i> Description is confusing and problem or needs are not demonstrated. Background information to understand history and context is missing. Data, evidence, or assessment are missing, or do not demonstrate or confirm the problem or need.</p>	



**(2) Analysis of Options** (0-20 pts.)

- Who is the target population served through this program?
- Please describe the other 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? What are the innovative or creative aspects of the program, if any?

**Scoring Criteria**

*20 = 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.

*10 = 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



**(3) Program Development and Implementation**  
(0-20 pts.)

- Were a vision and goals developed as part of the program planning? If so, what are the goals and/or objectives of the program?
- Describe how you implemented the solution and the level of effort required. Consider:  
Resources: Was the effort to change labor intensive? How many staff members were involved? What did they do to help implement your solution? Were volunteers used? How many? Did you hire consultants? What did they do? What was the cost of implementing the program? What were/are your funding sources for this program or process? What new technology did you have to buy and apply to implement the program, if any?  
Collaboration: If there was collaboration, who did you work with, how, and why?  
Resources: What activities, steps, or tasks were needed to develop the program or make the necessary changes?
- Describe how the program works or operates. What quality control processes does the agency have in place to ensure/verify the program is operating as intended?

**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, and consultants needed to implement the program and their roles and responsibilities. Description of development/implementation costs and sources of funding; 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; evidence of “must dos” and “don’t ever do” presented for reference by others.

*(CONTINUED)*



	<p><i>10 = GOOD/MODERATE</i>          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 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 consultants needed to implement the program and their roles and responsibilities; description of development/ implementation costs and sources of funding; 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.</p> <p><i>0 = INCOMPLETE</i>          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, and consultants needed to implement the program and their roles and responsibilities; description of development/ implementation costs and sources of funding; description of any new technology used; explanation of any collaboration (who, how, why); no evidence that quality controls are in place for program evaluation; timelines and benchmarks for implementation not included; no evidence of “must dos” and “don’t ever do” presented for reference by others.</p>	
	<p><b><u>(4) Program Strengths</u></b> (0-10 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the best attributes of this program?</li> <li>• What would you change?</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring Criteria</b></p> <p><i>10=EXCELLENT</i>          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.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(CONTINUED)</i></p>	



	<p><i>5=GOOD/MODERATE</i> 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</p> <p><i>0=INCOMPLETE</i> No evaluation of program strengths or attributes. Analysis of program strengths versus weaknesses/ limitations is missing; no recommendations for program improvements</p>	
	<p><b>(5) Program Outcomes</b> (0-20 pts.)</p> <p>Based on the ROMA category in which this program is nominated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the outcomes of this program?</li> <li>• How do you define program success? Why do you consider this program a success?</li> <li>• Document how the program measurably improves the lives of low income people. Describe outcomes numerically, if possible. Can you provide any measures demonstrating efficiency and effectiveness? In addition, you may provide qualitative assessments of program outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring Criteria</b> <i>20= EXCELLENT</i> Demonstrated <i>actual</i> 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</p> <p><i>10= GOOD/MODERATE</i> 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</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(CONTINUED)</b></p>	



	<p><i>0 = INCOMPLETE</i> 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 project can be sustained.</p>	
	<p><b>(6) Future Development for the Program</b> (0-10 pts.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="radio"/> What have you learned from implementing this program?</li><li><input type="radio"/> What advice or recommendations would you have for others considering your program?</li></ul> <p><b>Scoring Criteria</b></p> <p><i>10 = EXCELLENT</i> 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</p> <p><i>5 = GOOD/MODERATE</i> 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</p> <p><i>0 = INCOMPLETE</i> 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</p>	

**TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_