

**Minnesota Office of Justice Programs  
Direct Services to Crime Victims  
FY17 Application Review Form**

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_  
Expansion Score: \_\_\_\_\_  
(if applicable)

Applicant Organization Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions:** Use this form to evaluate how well the applicant provides the requested information. See enclosed *Reviewer Instructions* for more info.

**1. Current Organizational Information** (15 points, 1-2 pages)

a. **Mission/History:**

- Is the organization’s mission clearly stated?
- Are the years providing services included?

b. **Current Services:**

- Does the narrative list the primary crime victim services currently being provided?
- Is the list detailed sufficiently so you understand the applicant’s services?

c. **Current Office Location:**

- Are office locations (city and county) identified from where services are provided?
- If mobile services exist, are the counties (or area) served clearly identified?

d. **Population(s) Served:**

- Are the primary service populations clearly identified?
- If applicable, did the applicant identify which traditionally underserved populations their organization’s **primary focus** is to provide services to a?

e. **Funding Sources:**

- Did the applicant identify their major funding sources in a clear list?

**Org. Info Score (out of 15):** \_\_\_\_\_

Strengths of this proposal’s organizational information:

Weaknesses of this proposal’s organizational information:

**2. Organizational Capacity** (40 points, 3 pages)

**a. Needs Statement:**

The applicant needs to provide facts and quantitative data to demonstrate the demand and need for services.

- How effectively do the facts and quantitative data support and explain the need for services?
- How compelling a case did the applicant make for services?

**b. Capacity:**

- How compelling is the case made why this organization should receive funding?
- How well did the applicant describe its capacity to provide accessible and appropriate services? (See “Definitions” section in the RFP, pg. 4)

**c. Collaboration:**

- How effectively did the applicant identify its major collaborative partners and explain how their collaborative efforts improve the response to crime victims?

**Capacity Score (out of 40): \_\_\_\_\_**

Strengths of this proposal’s organizational capacity:

Weaknesses of this proposal’s organizational capacity:

**3. Community Outreach** (20 points, 1 page)

a. **Awareness:**

- How well does the applicant describe their community outreach plan?
- How effective do the strategies appear to be?
- How broad is the approach (i.e., variety of advertising mediums and presence at community events, promotional materials, geographically covering full service area, use of media, etc.)?

b. **Specific Outreach to Underserved:**

- To what extent does the outreach specifically target traditionally underserved populations?
- How effective do the strategies appear for increasing awareness and utilization of services?
- How creative and thorough is the applicant in its outreach plan?

c. **Community Engagement and Partnerships:**

- How effective do the strategies appear for strengthening community support (financial and otherwise)?
- How likely will the described efforts increase engagement with community partners and collaborators?

**Community Outreach Score (out of 20): \_\_\_\_\_**

Strengths of this proposal's community outreach:

Weaknesses of this proposal's community outreach:

4. **Evaluation** (15 points, 1 page)

a. **Process:**

- How clearly does the applicant describe the organization's evaluation process?

b. **Tools:**

- How effective are the evaluation tools for gathering constructive and reliable feedback from crime victims and clients served?

c. **Barriers:**

- How clearly described are anticipated barriers?

d. **Using Feedback:**

- How well does the applicant provide relevant findings from recent past evaluation efforts?
- How effectively does the applicant use evaluation data for program and service improvement?

**Evaluation Score (out of 15): \_\_\_\_\_**

Strengths of this proposal's evaluation:

Weaknesses of this proposal's evaluation:

5. **Budget** (10 points)

a. Is budget reasonable and appropriate?

b. Are all line items clearly itemized and with calculations?

c. If this application is funded, do you recommend any changes in the requested funding level or budget? Why?

**Budget Score (out of 10): \_\_\_\_\_**

Please add up your scores and enter the total on the front page. The total possible points is 100.

**Expansion Initiatives Addendum** (30 points, 1-3 pages)

- a. Is the proposed expansion clearly listed and does each numbered item include geographic area, special populations (if applicable), type of crime victim services and budget? (See RFP example.)
- b. How clearly does the applicant detail how the proposed expansion fits one or more of the following?
  - Services for crime victims they currently provide for which they do not receive funding
  - Something they think is critical to undertake or provide that they're unable to do because they lack resources
  - Their agency is getting a demand for services for which they're not funded
- c. How compelling is the case for expansion? Do they include data that supports the need?
- d. How well do they describe their reasoning for how their expansion list is prioritized?

Strengths of this proposal's expansion request:

**Expansion Score (out of 30):** \_\_\_\_\_  
(put score on front page)

Weaknesses of this proposal's expansion request: