



**StartTodaySD Incentive  
SCORING RUBRIC**

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Compliance with Format Requirements /10 Points**

Exemplary (8 – 10)	Adequate (4 - 7)	Needs Improvement (0 – 3)	Score
The submission meets all formatting requirements.	The submission meets most formatting requirements.	The submission was not compliant with the formatting requirements.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Overall Quality of Proposal /20 Points**

Exemplary (16 - 20)	Adequate (9 - 15)	Needs Improvement (0 – 8)	Score
The application narrative includes a thorough and complete discussion on the overall vision and value of the program.	The narrative includes an adequate discussion on the overall vision and value of the program.	Proposal is vague. No clear plan of action or strategies for implementation.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Strength of Program Plan /15 Points**

Exemplary (16 – 15)	Adequate (7 – 15)	Needs Improvement (0 – 7)	Score
The project has a thorough and effective design with a well-defined plan of action and strategies for timely implementation.	Adequate project design with defined plan of action and strategies for implementation, but project design is somewhat unclear and/or disorganized.	Project design is vague. No clear plan of action or strategies for implementation.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Sustainability Plan /10 Points**

Exemplary (8 – 10)	Adequate (4 - 7)	Needs Improvement (0 – 3)	Score
The application narrative clearly articulates how the project will continue after the period of performance.	The application narrative somewhat discusses how the project will continue after the period of performance.	The application narrative for sustainability is vague. No clear plan for continuation after the period of performance.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Strength of Plan to Increase Under-Represented Populations****/15 Points**

<b>Exemplary</b> (16 – 15)	<b>Adequate</b> (7 – 15)	<b>Needs Improvement</b> (0 – 7)	<b>Score</b>
The application narrative includes a thorough and complete discussion on the inclusion and engagement of partners, identifying appropriate collaborative partners, each of which add considerable value to the program.	The narrative includes an adequate discussion on the inclusion and engagement of partners, but only shows some indication of appropriate collaborative partners and lacks clearly defined roles and contributions expected of each partner.	Critical project partner(s) are missing from the project design and/or partner contributions are unclear.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Partnership between One-Stop Office and Related Project****/10 Points**

<b>Exemplary</b> (8 – 10)	<b>Adequate</b> (4 - 7)	<b>Needs Improvement</b> (0 – 3)	<b>Score</b>
The application narrative clearly articulates how the project partner with the One-Stop Office(s).	The application narrative somewhat discusses how the project partner with the One-Stop Office(s).	The application narrative for discussing a partnership with the One-Stop Office(s) is vague.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Use of Funding****/10 Points**

<b>Exemplary</b> (8 – 10)	<b>Adequate</b> (4 - 7)	<b>Needs Improvement</b> (0 – 3)	<b>Score</b>
The application narrative clearly articulates how funds will be utilized to support the project.	The application narrative somewhat discusses how funds will be utilized to support the project.	The application narrative for use of funds is vague. No clear plan on how funds will be used to support the project.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Commitment Letters****/10 Points**

<b>Exemplary</b> (8 – 10)	<b>Adequate</b> (4 - 7)	<b>Needs Improvement</b> (0 – 3)	<b>Score</b>
Commitment letters from all critical partner thoroughly describe the contributions.	Commitment letters from all critical partner adequately describe the contributions.	Commitment letters from critical partner where not included. Partner contributions are vague.	
<b>Comments:</b>			

**Total Points \_\_\_\_\_/100**