Reviewer Name: ____________________________________________

Signature of Reviewer: ______________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________

The attached score sheet represents my grading of the application submitted by

Applicant: __________________________________________________

The scores I have given are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Possible Score</th>
<th>Reviewer’s Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minimum Qualification (CVAS will complete)</td>
<td>To be completed by CVAS 15 Points possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project Proposal</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anticipated Outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Budget</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall Application Quality</td>
<td>+/- 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINAL SCORE**

*Comments after each section are encouraged in order to give feedback to grantees regarding areas of excellence and possible areas of improvement. Reviewers will not be identified.*
VOCA PROJECT GRANT EVALUATION SCORE SHEET

CVAS staff will complete the minimum qualifications (MQ) review and award up to 15 points. MQs include (among other things) evaluating the accuracy of the budget and budget narrative and making sure that the page requirements are not exceeded. There is no need for reviewers to take off additional points in these areas.

Reviewers may award up to the total indicated number of points indicated in each section.

1. Project Proposal (50 points) SCORE:

   A. Is there a direct and logical connection between the specific needs as described in the application and the proposed project activities and/or services described?

   B. Does the application adequately describe and justify the services to be offered to clients, who will be receiving services, and the manner in which services will be provided?

   C. Does the application present objective, factual information that supports the need or the problems of the specific population to be served, rather than subjective, unsubstantiated claims and assertions or global or generalized problems?

   D. Does the application discuss effective coordination with other service providers, law enforcement and the criminal justice system?

   E. Does the application include a reasonable timetable for major project tasks?

   F. Does the application discuss the role and responsibilities of each project staff person in relationship to the overall grant project? Are position descriptions attached?

   G. If this is a collaborative project, are letters of collaboration attached?

   H. Programs that are requesting funding for an existing VOCA project should discuss successful outcomes from the past year. If the grant proposal is to renew an existing VOCA Project Grant, the proposal should include Section 8f: Project Grant Year in Review. If this narrative exists, the information should be taken into consideration as part of this section. However, applicants who are not seeking funds for an existing VOCA project should not be penalized.

Comments:
2. **Anticipated Outcomes (10 points)**

   **SCORE:**

   A. Does the application identify at least one reasonable goal that is to be accomplished through this grant?

   B. Does the grant define at least one specific objective? Can this objective be defined as a change that will occur as a result of this proposal?

   C. Does the application identify two measurable outcomes that are derived directly from the specific problems and needs discussed in the Project Proposal section, and are those outcomes based upon the direct victim services to be provided through this grant?

   D. Are the measurable outcomes expressed in objectively quantifiable terms, using measurable outcomes? In other words, will it be possible to measure the extent to which the anticipated outcomes will be attained by the end of each quarter, and at the end of the project period?

   E. Does the application discuss the data to be collected (used in measuring the anticipated outcomes) and how those data will be used to assess the project?

   **Comments:**

3. **BUDGET (15 points)**

   **SCORE:**

   A. **Budget is directly and appropriately related to the proposed project:**
   Are the proposed personnel and operating expenses (grant and match dollars) essential and logically related to the direct victim services, as described in the Project Grant Proposal?

   B. **Budget Narratives:** Are the expenses accompanied by a brief but clear explanation of the expense? Are matching funds accounted for and included?

   C. **Cost Effectiveness:** Are the budgeted amounts reasonable in light of the nature and scope of the proposed activities and the number of victims to be served?

   **NOTE:** It is acceptable for applicants to seek grant funds that only partially support the full costs of an entire project (e.g. grant dollars would fund only personnel, but not the operating costs, of the activities).
4. **Overall Application Qualities (+/- 10 points) SCORE**

A. **Complete, clear and responsive application:** each section of the application should be complete and responsive. The information provided should be sufficiently detailed to allow fair evaluation, given space limitations.

B. **Project cohesiveness:** the application should be written in a manner that demonstrates a clear understanding of the overall project needs, activities and outcomes. Each part of the proposal should fit together into a cohesive project.

C. **Overall concept:** Taking the application as a whole, the proposed project should serve the intended victim population(s) in an effective and appropriate manner. Is the project feasible and likely to succeed? Does it appear to be a “good investment” of limited funding dollars? Is it a worthwhile concept? Does it demonstrate any special values that deserve to be recognized?

Comments: