

**DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES COUNCIL OF OKLAHOMA
PROJECT REQUEST EVALUATION RUBRIC**

Pre-Screening of Project Application: Proposals must meet the following baseline requirements before moving to a detailed scoring review. All questions must be answered yes to move forward automatically, though committee discretion may apply for borderline cases.	YES	NO
Does the proposal address at least one Council State Plan Goal?	☐	☐
Does the proposal support people with developmental disabilities and/or their families?	☐	☐
Is there a line-item budget included with a documented 25% non-federal match from local, state, or other non-federal resources?	☐	☐
Does the proposal have a viable plan to continue the work without Council funding?	☐	☐

Screening results: Were all answers above yes?	All were yes, move forward	Do not move forward	Mixed answers above. Move forward
☐	☐	☐	☐

Proposals passing the pre-screening are evaluated across 7 core categories. Each category will be scored on a scale from 1 to 10 points, resulting in a maximum possible score of 70 points.

					TOTAL RATING
	WEAK	FAIR	GOOD	STRONG	
STATE PLAN GOALS	Relevance to Council goals is not stated.	Mentions a theme, but connection to the Council's 5 Year Plan Goals is unclear.	Addresses at least one specific state plan objective.	Aligns with a Council State Plan Goal and objective with a high-impact strategy.	
NEED & TARGET POPULATION	The problem is not known, target population is unclear, no needs assessment stated.	Describes a general problem but does not give supporting data or specific population details.	Problem is understood, targeted population well-defined.	Uses needs assessment to target specific group, identifies a unique problem, and proposes a solution.	
BUDGET	Does not follow Council funding rules.	Budget is not clear; match sources are not known.	Provides a budget and a 25% non-federal match.	Provides detailed itemized costs; detailed 25% non-federal match	
SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT	No sustainability plan is provided.	Sustainability plan has no timeline.	Provides a general timeline for sustainability of project and may have some general funding ideas.	Provides detailed funding sources and detailed timeline for sustainability of the project.	
INNOVATION	Duplicates existing work in Oklahoma, supplants current funding.	Similar to existing programs; unique value is not clearly explained.	Expands on existing work or brings a proven program to a new area.	Unique and innovative; Delivers brand-new outcomes.	
PLAN & CAPACITY	Confusing plan. Statement of Work has no milestones. Team has limited experience.	Missing key details, Mentions best practices but doesn't provide research citations.	Statement of Work has clear milestones. Team is qualified, Uses best practices.	Statement of work is ready for contract. Team has proven track record. Relies on research.	
IMPACT & METRICS	Outcomes missing. Federal performance measures left blank or zero.	Metrics are not clear. Potential for lasting change is unclear.	Gives clear outcomes and realistic numbers for required federal performance measures.	Has a way to track baseline and monitoring impact, Targets state level changes.	
OUTREACH & ACCESSIBILITY	No marketing or outreach plan.	Outreach plan is minimal (for example, "just Facebook"), lacks rural or accessibility information.	Clear marketing channels and has identified target audiences, includes translation plans.	Well thought and clear plan, Strong partnerships, Plan to ensure accessibility	
TOTAL RATING (all scores tallied) (70 maximum points possible)					

Financial sustainability is defined as maintaining services provided to the community **without Council funding** and can be documented through partnerships, donors, fundraising, grants (private, foundation, federal, state, and a reasonable fee for service).