

REGION 7E AMHI SCORING FORM

2027–2028 Funding Cycle

Ratings are compiled from a consensus discussion of Governing Board members and recorded in the meeting minutes. The resulting scores are considered by the Governing Board when voting on funding awards.

Rate each category on a scale of 1–4 using the Scoring Guide on page 2. For category 4, score only one of the two sections, for previously funded programs or for new providers and programs.

Applicant Information

Organization:		
Program:		
Amount Requested:		Date:

Scoring

Category	Category Description	Key Considerations	Score (1-4)
1	Regional Priority Alignment & Gap Addressed	Does the proposal address a regional priority (housing, transportation, employment) and/or fill a specific, well-documented gap or barrier in the current service system for the SPMI adult population?	
2	Proposal Completeness & Capacity	Is the application complete? Does the proposal demonstrate capacity to deliver the program or service as described? Is there ability to collect and report program outcomes?	
3	Budget Detail	Does the budget clearly itemize how funds will be spent and tie costs to specific activities or services?	
4 (score only one)	If Program Previously Funded: Track Record	If previously funded: did the program meet projected numbers served, stay on budget, and serve all counties equitably?	
	For New Providers or Programs: Relevant Experience & Feasibility	Does the applicant have a track record of delivering similar services elsewhere (comparable outcomes, populations, or partnerships)? Does the proposed staffing, timeline, and referral/intake plan demonstrate the program can launch and run as described?	
5	Cost-Effectiveness	Is the cost per person reasonable and clearly justified relative to the services delivered?	
	TOTAL SCORE	<i>out of 20 possible points</i>	

Governing Board Recommendation

☐ Fully Fund ☐ Partially Fund ☐ Do Not Fund

Conditions / Comments:

SCORING GUIDE

Use these anchors to keep scores consistent and comparable across applications.

Category	Category Description	1 — Does not meet	2 — Partially meets	3 — Meets	4 — Strong / exceeds
1	Regional Priority Alignment & Gap Addressed	Does not address housing, transportation, or employment, and no clear gap identified; largely duplicates existing services	Loosely touches a priority area or gap, but rationale is vague or unsupported	Clearly addresses one priority area, or identifies a specific, well-documented gap.	Clearly addresses two or more priority areas, or a significant gap with strong evidence the program uniquely fills it
2	Proposal Completeness & Capacity	Application is missing key information; Lacks capacity for proposed program or service. No program outcomes identified.	Application includes partial information; Limited capacity for proposed program or service. Limited program outcomes identified.	Complete application; Capacity to deliver proposed program. Program outcomes are identified.	Thorough and well-organized; Strong capacity to deliver proposed program or service. More than one measurable program outcome is identified.
3	Budget Detail	Budget lacks detail or is missing key information.	Budget vague in areas or lacks description. Includes key information.	Budget is detailed, itemized, and tied to activities.	Budget supports detailed full line-item review, includes detailed narrative descriptions, and is tied to activities.
4 (score only one)	Ongoing Programs: Track Record	Significantly underperformed, no explanation.	Mixed performance, limited explanation.	Met most projections, on budget. Met most expectations of those served and R7E.	Met/exceeded projections, equitable service, on budget. Met/exceeded expectations of those served and R7E.
	New Programs or Providers: Relevant Experience & Feasibility	No relevant experience delivering similar services. No clear staffing/timeline/plan for program.	Limited or indirect relevant experience. Implementation plan has gaps (staffing, timeline, or referral process is unclear);	Relevant experience with similar populations or services. Clear, workable implementation plan for proposed program.	Strong, well-documented track record in comparable programs/services. Detailed, realistic implementation plan.
5	Cost-Effectiveness	Cost per person high relative to comparable programs; no justification.	Cost per person reasonable; justification limited.	Cost per person reasonable and clearly justified.	Strong value per person, with clear evidence of efficient use of funds.