



**State of Florida  
Department of Children and Families**

**Rick Scott**  
*Governor*

**Mike Carroll**  
*Secretary*

---

ADDENDUM #003 to the following Request for Applications (RFA):

Prevention Partnership Grant (PPG)

Advertisement Number: RFA10H17GN1

---

Section 4.3, Unallowable activities is hereby amended to read:

The second stage of review involves the evaluation of all Applications that are in compliance with the mandatory criteria in the first stage of evaluation. The second stage of the evaluation is a scoring by the Grant Review Committee using the criteria described in **Appendix K**.

---

**FAILURE TO FILE A PROTEST WITHIN THE TIME PRESCRIBED IN S. 120.57(3), F.S., OR FAILURE TO POST THE BOND OR OTHER SECURITY REQUIRED BY LAW WITHIN THE TIME ALLOWED FOR FILING A BOND SHALL CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF PROCEEDINGS UNDER CHAPTER 120, F.S.**

1317 Winewood Boulevard, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0700

---

Mission: Protect the Vulnerable, Promote Strong and Economically Self-Sufficient Families, and Advance Personal and Family Recovery and Resiliency

Appendix K

State of Florida  
Department of Children and Families



GRANT# - RFA10H17GN1  
Prevention Partnership Grant (PPG)  
Evaluation Manual

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

**1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

- 1.1 Each Grant Review Committee member (evaluator) will evaluate the applications that pass the mandatory criteria. Each evaluation criterion must be scored. Fractional values will not be accepted.
- 1.2 Each evaluator shall assign a score for each evaluation criterion based upon his or her assessment of the application. The assignment of an individual score must be based upon the following description of the point scores:

The application demonstrates or describes	Category	Points
...extensive competency, proven capabilities, an outstanding approach to the subject area, innovative, practical and effective solutions, a clear and complete understanding of inter-relationships, full responsiveness, a clear and comprehensive understanding of the requirements and planning for the unforeseen.	Superior	4
...clear competency, consistent capability, a reasoned approach to the subject area, feasible solutions, a generally clear and complete description of inter-relationships, extensive but incomplete responsiveness and a sound understanding of the requirements.	Good	3
...fundamental competency, adequate capability, a basic approach to the subject area, apparently feasible but somewhat unclear solutions, a basic description of inter-relationships in some areas, partial responsiveness, a fair understanding of the requirements and minimum acceptable staff experience and skills in some areas.	Adequate	2
...little competency, minimal capability, an inadequate approach to the subject area, infeasible or ineffective solutions, unclear, incomplete or non-responsive, a lack of understanding of the requirements and a lack of demonstrated experience and skills.	Poor	1
...a significant or complete lack of understanding, an incomprehensible approach, a significant or complete lack of skill and experience and extensive non-responsiveness.	Insufficient	0

- 1.3 Evaluators should record references to the sections of the RFA and the application materials which most directly pertain to the criterion and upon which their scores were based. Evaluators should not attempt an exhaustive documentation of every bit of information considered but only key information. In general, the reference statements should be brief.
- 1.4 If the application does not address an evaluation criterion, evaluators should indicate "not addressed" and score it as "Insufficient." Where information is not addressed in the appropriate section or is difficult to find, evaluators should indicate so and deduct points accordingly.
- 1.5 Each evaluator has been provided an electronic copy of the RFA, including its appendices, amendments, written inquiries and the replies provided by the Department. Each evaluator will be provided an electronic copy of each Grant application which should be evaluated and scored according to the instructions provided in the solicitation and this evaluation manual.
- 1.6 Applications shall be independently scored by each member of the evaluation team using a web-based system. No collaboration is permitted during the scoring process. The same scoring principles must be applied to every application reviewed. Evaluators should work carefully to be as thorough as possible in order to ensure a fair and open competitive procurement. No attempt by Department personnel, other evaluators or other persons to influence an evaluator's scoring shall be tolerated.
- 1.7 If any attempt is made to influence an evaluator, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Procurement Manager. If such an attempt is made by the Procurement Manager, the evaluator must immediately report the incident to the Inspector General.

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1.8 Only the rating criteria provided should be used.
- 1.9 Evaluators may request assistance in understanding evaluation criteria and applications only from the Procurement Manager.
- 1.10 Questions related to the solicitation and evaluation of the applications should be directed only to:
- Michele Staffieri, Procurement Manager  
Department of Children and Families, Office of SAMH  
1317 Winewood Blvd., Bldg. 6, Room 231  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700  
E-Mail Address: Michele.staffieri@myflfamilies.com
- 1.11 After each evaluator has completed the scoring, the Procurement Manager will compile the scores. The Procurement Manager will average the total point scores by each evaluator to calculate the points awarded for each section.
- 1.12 Following completion of the independent evaluations of the applications, the Procurement Manager will hold a meeting to validate evaluator scoring. The purpose of the meeting is to ensure that evaluation scores were captured correctly when preparing the total scores.

## 2 APPLICATION POINT VALUES

- The maximum score for the Programmatic portion of the Application is 164 points.
- The minimum score to be eligible for award recommendation is 123 points.

Criteria	Points	Weighted Value	Maximum Points	Points Assigned
Criteria 1: Needs Assessment Logic Model (NALM)	8	4	32	
Criteria 2: Comprehensive Community Action Plan (CCAP)	24	1	24	
Criteria 3: Project Narrative	12	3	36	
Criteria 4: Evaluation Plan	24	1	24	
Criteria 5: Organizational Structure and Qualifications	24	1	24	
Criteria 6: Project Master Schedule/Timeline	12	1	12	
Criteria 7: Financial Management & Budget	12	1	12	
<b>Total</b>	<b>116</b>		<b>164</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 1: Needs Assessment Logic Model (NALM)</u></b>	
Tab 3 - RFA References: Section 3.6.3; Appendix F	
How well does the NALM:	Points (0-4 each)
<p>1. Describe or analyze the empirical data and indicate the nature of the relationship between risk and protective factors and all state consumption priorities?</p> <p><i>The application should address the following state consumption priorities: 1) underage drinking; 2) marijuana use; and 3) non-medical prescription drug use.</i></p>	
<p>2. Indicate that the proposed program and strategies can cause the desired change?</p> <p><i>The application should indicate a causal relationship between risk and protective factors and drug consumption.</i></p>	
Subtotal <i>(Max 8 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	4
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 32 Points)</i></b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 2: Comprehensive Community Action Plan (CCAP)</u></b>	
Tab 4 - RFA References: Section 3.6.4; Appendix I	
How well does the CCAP:	Points (0-4 each)
1. Outline the goals and objectives related to state consumption priorities?	
2. Identify and address the target population (and other stakeholders, if applicable)?	
3. Describe the proposed program, practice or strategy, including identification according to the Institute of Medicine's intervention categories?  <i>The description should include the name, participant selection criteria and process, risk and protective factors addressed, duration, frequency, sequence and schedule of activities, resource requirements, cost estimates and should indicate the program, practice or strategy as one of the following intervention categories: universal, selective, and indicated prevention interventions.</i>	
4. Demonstrate the theoretical and conceptual fit between each program, practice, or strategy and the risk and protective factors identified in the NALM?  <i>The application should provide information sufficient to justify the selection of the program, practice, or strategy as an appropriate approach to the problem.</i>	
5. Describe how each proposed program, practice, or strategy is feasible in light of the community's capacity, readiness to act, and resources and how it will be implemented in a culturally competent manner?	
6. Describe how youth or youth coalitions will be actively engaged in the Project?	
Subtotal (Max 24 Points)	
Weighted Value	1
<b>Total Points (Max 24 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 3: Project Narrative</u></b>	
<b>Tab 5 - RFA References: Section 3.6.5</b>	
<b>How well does the Project Narrative:</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
<p>1. Demonstrate the need for the proposed services and the effects of the resulting outcomes? <i>The application should clearly identify how the proposed services were selected, the desired outcomes and how the desired outcomes will affect the community.</i></p>	
<p>2. Describe the substance use consumption behavior and consequence being targeted for change, and why this is a problem, where, and among whom? <i>The application should include data supporting the targeted problem(s) and behavior(s).</i></p>	
<p>3. Specify the number of participants expected to be part of the group events proposed to be conducted for universal and selective strategies?  OR Specify the number of individuals expected as program participants for each population for indicated prevention programs?</p>	
Subtotal <i>(Max 12 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	3
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 36 Points)</i></b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 4: Evaluation Plan</u></b>	
Tab 6 - RFA References: Section 3.6.6; Appendix G	
How well does the Evaluation Plan explain and describe:	Points (0-4 each)
1. How consumption priorities, risk and protective factors, process measures, performance measures, goals, and objectives will be measured and reported.	
2. All relevant data sources and their strengths and limitations.	
3. The theory underlying the program or strategy.	
4. Evaluation questions that are stated in terms so that they can be answered using available methods and in a way that is informative to stakeholders.	
5. Evaluation methods and procedures.	
6. Resources available to support the evaluation component.	
Subtotal <i>(Max 24 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	1
Total Points <i>(Max 24 Points)</i>	



Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Criteria 5: Organizational Structure and Qualifications</b>	
Tab 7 - RFA References: Section 3.6.7; Appendix J	
How well does the application describe:	Points (0-4 each)
<p>1. The organizational chart, including the structure of staff, subcontractors and partner organizations that will be providing direct or support services for the Project? <i>The chart should clearly display the relationships between staff members and all organizations involved in the Project.</i></p>	
<p>2. Staffing pattern that is appropriate for the proposed Project, including the duties of each staff person, number of FTE staff and direct service subcontractors and how the Project aligns with their mission, administrative capacity and experience in providing similar services in the local community?</p>	
<p>3. Information technology capacity, including the ability to collect and accurately enter data electronically?</p>	
<p>4. Prevention-specific experience of the organization and staff members, including training to be provided? <i>The description should include supporting documentation demonstrating organizational policies for staff development, training and qualifications of staff members involved in the Project, and performance and outcome studies on previous prevention projects.</i></p>	
<p>5. How the capacity needs within the targeted community will be identified and addressed to ensure project success and how the Project and prevention efforts will be sustained beyond the funding of this grant?</p>	
<p>6. How the organization is involved in the development of the larger community's plan to address youth alcohol and other drug prevention issues? <i>The application should include the names of community substance abuse organizations and other social service planning groups that address substance abuse issues.</i></p>	
Subtotal (Max 24 Points)	
Weighted Value	1
<b>Total Points (Max 24 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 6: Project Master Schedule/Timeline</u></b>	
Tab 8 - RFA References: Section 3.6.8; Appendix H	
How well does the proposed master schedule/timeline:	Points (0-4 each)
<p>1. Outline each of the major steps or tasks of the Project for each year?</p> <p><i>The application should present a clear design for the Project, sufficient to account for all major steps in the process in a reasonable manner sufficient to demonstrate a thoroughly planned and organized approach to implementing the proposed Project.</i></p>	
<p>2. Outline who is responsible (staff member, position or organization) for each major step or task of the Project?</p> <p><i>The application should clearly identify the staff member or organization responsible for each major step or task during the Project. If the staff member is not identified, the position within the organization should be identified to demonstrate the capacity to implement the proposed Project.</i></p>	
<p>3. Outline a proposed start date for each major step or task of the Project (and end date, where appropriate)?</p> <p><i>The application should clearly identify estimated dates for implementing each major step or task in the Project, sufficient to demonstrate a logical approach to implementing the proposed Project.</i></p>	
Subtotal (Max 12 Points)	
Weighted Value	1
<b>Total Points (Max 12 Points)</b>	

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>Criteria 7: Financial Management &amp; Budget</u></b>	
<b>Tab 9 - RFA References: Sections 3.6.9 &amp; 3.6.10</b>	
<b>How well does the financial documentation demonstrate:</b>	<b>Points (0-4 each)</b>
<p>1. Overall capacity and experience to comply with state and federal rules and regulations applicable to this funding and how revenues and costs will be tracked to ensure that the program remains within budget?</p> <p><i>The application should include supporting documentation sufficient to demonstrate the financial capacity of the organization.</i></p>	
<p>2. A reasonable approach to the proposed budget and allowable expenditures:</p> <p><i>The application should include a budget narrative that clearly links all proposed budget costs with Project activities and details sufficient to demonstrate the calculation of proposed costs.</i></p>	
<p>3. Sufficient funds allocated for attendance to a minimum of one statewide prevention-related conference.</p> <p><i>The application should include budgeting for the grant coordinator and one other person to annually attend a prevention-related conference.</i></p>	
Subtotal <i>(Max 12 Points)</i>	
Weighted Value	1
<b>Total Points <i>(Max 12 Points)</i></b>	