

Attachment G – Scoring Rubric

The selection committee will award points to each section of the grant proposal. The following rubric will help the committee determine how many points to assign. The range of points differs for each section and awarded points may be any whole number between 0 and the maximum points available for the section.

1. PROJECT DESIGN

A. WORKFORCE NEED, INCLUDING EMPLOYER LETTER(S) – *see page 8 of the RFP*

Poor (0 points)	Fair (15 points)	Ideal (30 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employer applicant did not address any of the elements listed in the Ideal section. ▪ Non employer applicant did not include letters from employer partners. ▪ Applicant/employer letters addressed the elements listed in the Ideal section, but all of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ No evidence of workforce need. ▪ No evidence that participants will advance their healthcare careers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant/employer letters only addressed half of the elements listed in the Ideal section. ▪ Applicant/employer letters addressed the elements listed in the Ideal section, but half of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ Mediocre evidence of workforce need. ▪ Mediocre evidence that participants will advance their healthcare careers. ▪ Employer letters did not include a scanned signature or contact information for the project point person. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employer applicant fully addressed all of the following elements (information is clear, workforce need is evident, and participants’ healthcare careers will clearly benefit from the project): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Current and projected (through 02/13) hiring needs. ✓ Types of training/credentials required to meet hiring needs. ✓ If no credential required, there is a good explanation why. ✓ Incumbent worker project: a list of job titles potential participants currently hold and what titles they will be promoted into. ✓ Wage gain information. ✓ If no promotion, a good explanation for how the training will benefit the participants’ career. ✓ If serving unemployed or dislocated workers, an explanation for why their current workforce cannot meet hiring needs. ▪ Non employer applicant attached letters from all employer partners and the letters fully address all elements outlined above. Letters also include a scanned signature and the name/contact information for the project point person.

B. PROJECT STRATEGY AND WORKPLAN– *see page 9 of the RFP*

Notes for this section:

Employer sites are not required to have represented employees. Applicants will not be penalized or rewarded for their union affiliation status.

Poor (0 points)	Fair (15 points)	Ideal (30 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant did not address any of the elements listed in the Ideal section. ▪ Applicant addressed the elements listed in the Ideal section, but all of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ No evidence that participants will have the support they need to be successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant only addressed half of the elements listed in the Ideal section. ▪ Applicant addressed the elements listed in the Ideal section, but half of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ Mediocre evidence that participants will have the support they need to be successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant fully and clearly addressed all of the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A detailed description of the training program(s), including where the program will be held, the length of the program, type of program (online, classroom, apprenticeship, etc.) and information about the instructor(s). ✓ Strong strategies for ensuring participant success – these may include flexible work schedules, paid training time, support services, case management, mentoring and other supports. ✓ A detailed description of the roles of each project partner. ✓ Healthcare workers and/or unions are clearly involved in the project design and implementation strategy development.

C. GRANT FUNDED ACTIVITIES & LEVERAGED RESOURCES - *see page 9 of the RFP*

Poor (0 points)	Fair (5 points)	Ideal (10 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant did not address any of the elements listed in the Ideal section. ▪ Applicant addressed the elements listed in the Ideal section, but all of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ No evidence that the applicant will meet the leveraged resources requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant only addressed two of the elements listed in the Ideal section. ▪ Applicant addressed all of the elements listed in the Ideal section, but some of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ Mediocre evidence that the applicant will meet the leveraged resources requirement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant fully and clearly addressed the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Which program costs will be paid for by the grant and which costs will be leveraged. ✓ The source(s) of leveraged resources. ✓ A strong plan to meet the leverage requirement before the end of the grant period.

D. CAPACITY BUILDING— see page 9 of the RFP

Notes for this section:

Applicants are not required to address all of the capacity building activities. Applicants will not be penalized or rewarded for the number or type of capacity building activities their project will focus on.

Poor (0 points)	Fair (10 points)	Ideal (20 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant did not address any of the capacity building activities listed in the Ideal section. ▪ No evidence that the project will help build Washington’s capacity to meet current and future healthcare workforce training needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant addressed at least one of the capacity building activities listed in the Ideal section, but some of the information is weak or unclear. ▪ Mediocre evidence that the project will help build Washington’s capacity to meet current and future healthcare workforce training needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant fully and clearly addressed one or more of the following capacity building activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Advancing entry-level workers along the healthcare career pathway and creating entry level job openings. ✓ Increasing online and workplace learning opportunities in healthcare training programs. ✓ Increasing clinical rotation capacity. ▪ The project will clearly help build Washington’s capacity to meet current and future healthcare workforce training needs.

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT— see page 9 of the RFP

Poor (0 points)	Fair (5 points)	Ideal (10 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant included no information about the project manager. ▪ Applicant did not list any information about other staff even though it is clear in the proposal that staff will be supporting grant activities. ▪ No evidence that the project has the staffing and experience level needed to be successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant included only partial information about the project manager (we are looking for name, qualifications, responsibilities and experience managing other projects). ▪ Applicant only listed partial information about other staff involved in grant activities (we are looking for name, qualifications and responsibilities). ▪ Mediocre evidence that the project has the staffing and experience level needed to be successful. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant fully and clearly identifies the project manager and her/his qualifications, responsibilities and experience managing similar projects. ▪ Applicant fully and clearly identifies other project staff (if applicable) and their qualifications/ responsibilities. ▪ Applicant includes the amount of time each person will be spending on the project. ▪ The project clearly has the level of staffing and experience needed to be successful.

2. QUARTERLY PROJECTED OUTCOMES CHART

Notes for this section:

Applicants are required to meet outcomes by the end of the grant period. Applicants will not be penalized or rewarded for the amount of time it takes to meet outcomes. Please also note that if the training program does not come with an industry recognized credential, but a good explanation for this is provided in the *Project Design* section, then the applicant should not be penalized for not meeting those credential outcomes.

Poor (0 points)	Fair (5 points)	Ideal (10 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The applicant does not include an outcomes chart for the project’s training program(s). ▪ The applicant includes charts for the project training programs, but none of the total columns meet the performance outcome requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The applicant includes an outcomes chart but does not include a separate one for each of the project training programs (if offering more than one type of training program). ▪ The applicant includes charts for all the project training programs, but the information is not complete. ▪ The numbers in the total columns meet only half of the performance outcome requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An outcomes chart is filled out (completely) for each type of training program (if offering more than one type of training program). ▪ The numbers in the total columns meet or exceed the performance outcome requirements listed on page 4 of the RFP.

3. CUMULATIVE QUARTERLY PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

Notes for this section:

Applicants are required to spend all grant money by the end of the grant period. Applicants should not be penalized or rewarded for the amount of time it takes to spend grant money.

Poor (0 points)	Fair (5 points)	Ideal (10 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Cumulative Quarterly Projected Expenditures form is filled out, but the applicant did not follow directions and the information provided does not include evidence of when grant money will be spent and that it will be fully spent by the end of the grant period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Cumulative Quarterly Projected Expenditures form is filled out, but half of the information is missing or unclear. ▪ The cumulative total listed in the Jan-Feb. box does not match the total grant funds requested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Cumulative Quarterly Projected Expenditures form is complete. ▪ The cumulative total listed in the Jan.-Feb. 2013 box matches the total grant funds requested.

4. BUDGET

Poor (0 points)	Fair (5 points)	Ideal (10 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant meets none of the requirements listed in the Ideal section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant meets half of the requirements listed in the Ideal section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant meets the following requirements in the budget form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Grant–Funded Project Cost total matches the total amount requested and the calculations are correct. ✓ The Leveraged Resources total meets the leveraged resources requirements listed on pages 3-4 of the RFP and calculations are correct. ✓ The Total Project costs equal grant-funded costs + leveraged resources. ✓ No in-direct costs are included in the budget.

5. BUDGET NARRATIVE— see page 10 of the RFP

Poor (0 points)	Fair (5 points)	Ideal (10 points)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant provides no budget detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant describes only half of the expenses encompassed within each section of the budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Applicant fully and clearly describes the expenses encompassed within each section of the budget. ▪ Applicant includes descriptions of policies that direct formulas (where applicable)