

TOBACCO MASTER SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT GRANT PRE-APPLICATION: PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR FISCAL YEARS 2015-2016 AND 2016-2017

Pre-Application Limit: 2 pages

Pre-Application Format: Times New Roman or Arial Font, single spaced, 1-inch margins

1) The project will address a proven, unmet, local need in a low-income population.

Modifier: 1.5

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. Evidence of unmet local need, low income, and other relevant attributes of this population are fully documented with local, regional, and national data from the most current and reliable sources. Population and need clearly relate to the description of the proposed project and evidence base.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. Evidence of unmet local need, low income, and other relevant attributes of this population are documented with local, regional, or national data. Population and need relate to the description of the proposed project and evidence base.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. Evidence of unmet local need, low income, and other relevant attributes of this population are incomplete, anecdotal and/or do not relate to the description of the proposed project and evidence base.

2) The project description is well articulated, complete, and relevant to other application criteria.

Modifier: 1

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. The project description clearly explains all of the major activities and deliverables that the applicant will carry out and the outcomes that the applicant expects to achieve. The description clearly shows how project activities, deliverables, and outcomes are achievable and relevant to the unmet need, target population, and evidence base referenced in criteria 1 and 3.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. The project description is mostly clear and includes major activities and deliverables that the applicant will carry out and outcomes that the applicant expects to achieve. The description shows how project activities, deliverables, and outcomes are mostly achievable and relevant to the unmet need, target population, and evidence base referenced in criteria 1 and 3.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. All or part of the project description is unclear. Major activities and deliverables are missing or unclear; may not be attainable within the scope of the project; or are not relevant to the outcomes, needs, and target population.

3) The applicant clearly establishes and supports the evidence base of the proposed project.

Modifier: 2

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. The proposal incorporates a practice that has a clear and replicable manual or model. Evidence from high-quality research studies has demonstrated the practice to be effective in achieving the outcomes proposed by the applicant, in a population similar to the applicant's target population. [The highest-quality research studies employ experimental controls and must be cited in order for practices to qualify for the highest points in this category. Practices may also be eligible for points in the lower end of this category if the studies cited did not have strong controls but were well designed and met the other criteria outlined above. Specific studies may be cited in the proposal, but literature reviews and/or established rating agency websites may instead be used as long as these sources clearly point to high-quality evidence supporting the practice.]

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. The proposal incorporates a practice that has a manual or model. Evidence from research studies or strong program evaluations has demonstrated the practice,

or a similar practice, to be effective in achieving outcomes proposed by the applicant, in a population similar or analogous to the applicant's target population.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. The proposal incorporates a practice without a model or without providing relevant or convincing evidence showing it to be effective in a population similar or analogous to the applicant's target population.

TOBACCO MASTER SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT GRANT FULL APPLICATION: PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016

Pre-Application Limit: 5 pages

Pre-Application Format: Times New Roman or Arial Font, single spaced, 1-inch margins

1) The applicant clearly demonstrates capacity to implement the proposed project with fidelity to the model of the proposed practice.

Modifier: 2

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. The applicant demonstrates a strong understanding of the evidence-based model described in the pre-application as well as the requirements for implementing the proposed practice. Model-adherent implementation requires a combination of training and coaching by a recognized practice expert, as well as implementation monitoring and outcome evaluation.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. The applicant demonstrates a basic understanding of the evidence-based model described in the pre-application as well as the requirements for implementing the proposed practice. Some training, coaching, or implementation monitoring will occur, but an ideal combination of these resources is not clearly dedicated to the proposed project.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. The applicant does not demonstrate that it adequately understands, or has not adequately established the evidence base for the model described in the pre-application. The proposed activities do not support adequate practice implementation, monitoring, or evaluation.

2) Evaluation is an integral part of program/project operation and monitors implementation and outcomes with a quality improvement approach. Outcomes are measurable and consistent with research and the program plan.

Modifier: 1.5

Scores of seven to nine: strong project evaluation plan. The evaluation plan monitors implementation, output, and outcome measures with a strong quality improvement approach. Evaluation tools are those commonly used in the practice and its supporting research. Implementation, output, and outcome data are clearly measurable within the timeframe and resources of the project. Evaluation is an integral component of program implementation.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory project evaluation plan. The evaluation monitors some combination of implementation, output, and outcome measures, with potential to inform quality improvement. Evaluation tools are relevant to the practice and its supporting research. Some implementation, output, and outcome data are measurable within the timeframe and resources of the project. Evaluation will occur, but may not be fully integrated with program implementation.

Scores of one to three: weak project evaluation plan. The evaluation plan does not adequately address implementation, output, or outcome measures. Evaluation tools are not appropriate to the practice or its supporting research. Data are not realistically measurable. Evaluation is not meaningfully part of program implementation.

3) The proposed project will increase the implementing Agency's capacity to deliver evidence based services.

Modifier: 1

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. A combination of training, coaching, mentoring, and experience will clearly foster staff's capacity to provide the evidence-based services beyond the grant funding term.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. Some training, coaching, mentoring, or experience is likely to foster staff's capacity to provide the evidence-based services beyond the grant funding term.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. The project will not provide adequate training, coaching, mentoring, or experience that would foster staff's capacity to provide the evidence-based practice, either during or beyond the grant funding term.

4) The project clearly identifies and addresses the diversity dimensions impacting the targeted project participants.

Modifier: 1

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. The applicant demonstrates thorough understanding of, and has clear plans to address, specific attributes, issues, or needs of the target population in a way that would facilitate target-population members' access to and retention in the proposed program.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. The applicant demonstrates a basic understanding of, and has plans to address, attributes, issues, or needs of the target population in a way that would facilitate target-population members' access to and retention in the proposed program.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. The applicant does not demonstrate adequate understanding of the attributes, issues, or needs of the target population and/or does not have an adequate plan to address these in a way that would likely facilitate target-population members' access to or retention in the proposed program.

5) The proposed project links appropriately with other community or school based programs in a way that leverages resources and provides additional value to the project.

Modifier: 1

Scores of seven to nine: excellent to exceptional. The applicant has demonstrated robust linkages between the project and other community- or school-based programs that are clearly relevant to the project, leverage resources, and provide great additional value to the project. Look for linkages illustrated in logic model and letters of commitment or memoranda of understanding from partner agencies.

Scores of four to six: satisfactory to very good. The applicant has demonstrated linkages between the project and other community- or school-based programs that are mostly relevant to the project, leverage resources, and provide some additional value to the project. Look for linkages illustrated in logic model and letters of commitment or memoranda of understanding from partner agencies.

Scores of one to three: poor to fair. The applicant has not convincingly demonstrated relevant linkages between the project and other community- or school-based programs and/or has not demonstrated that linkages will leverage resources or provide additional value to the project.

6) The proposed project addresses basic social safety net needs in at least one of the following categories: food, shelter, or economic self sufficiency

Modifier: 0.5

Scores of seven to nine indicate that the central purpose of the proposed project is to provide basic social safety net services in at least one of the following categories: food, shelter, or economic self-sufficiency.

Scores of four to six indicate that the proposed project provides basic social safety net services ancillary to its central purpose, or that the applicant demonstrates an indirect but compelling link between the services provided by the proposed project and clients' increased access to basic social safety net services in at least one of the following categories: food, shelter, or economic self-sufficiency.

Scores of zero to three indicate that the proposed project provides no basic social safety net services or provides an unclear connection to such services in one of the following categories: food, shelter, or economic self-sufficiency.