

Digital Access for All Idahoans Tech Refresh Grant 2024 - Scoring Rubric

Rating Area	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
<p>Demonstrated Need (30 pts) Questions 7 and 8</p> <p>Highest scores should be given to applicants that have a critical need in the community AND whose access is inadequate, or non-functional AND who have a clearly articulated plan for implementing change.</p> <p>Additional consideration should be given to applicants serving more than one covered population.</p>	<p>27-30 pts</p> <p>There is a clear and critical need for services related to digital access in the community, especially regarding covered populations. Few, if any applicable services exist in the community, or they are hard to access.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant has significantly inadequate digital access that results in severe limitations to its operations and the number, type, or quality of services offered to the community.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant has a clearly articulated plan for implementing change.</p>	<p>23-26 pts</p> <p>There is a moderate or high need for services in the community, but some services do exist. The community may have a significant population of individuals from covered populations.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant is able to carry out basic functions but is limited or constrained in its operations.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant has a moderately well-defined plan for implementing change.</p>	<p>17-22 pts</p> <p>The applicant meets one, but not both of the criteria for the “good” rating in this category.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>the following applies</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin: 0 auto;"/> <p>There is a moderate need for services in the community, but several services are available within the community or nearby.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant is somewhat limited in its operations but can perform most of its functions and operations at a reasonable level.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant lacks a clearly defined plan for implementing change.</p>	<p>0-16 pts</p> <p>If either of the following conditions are true:</p> <p>The community being served exists in an area with significant resources related to digital access.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The applicant organization is mostly functional or is otherwise not significantly constrained in its ability to carry out the number, type, or quality of services appropriate for the community.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The applicant did not develop a well-defined plan for implementing change.</p>

Rating Area	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
<p>Project Quality (35 pts) Questions 2, 12, 13, 14, and 15</p>	<p>32-35 pts</p> <p>A) The project being proposed is directly related to the needs of both the community and the grantee entity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The project fully addresses NTIA goals, goals for the DAAI Plan, and serves at least one covered population.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The scope and size of the project are sufficient and reasonable to meet the need.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The plans outlined for the project are applicable, reasonable, and necessary for the project being proposed.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The grantee plans to partner with an outside organization to fulfill the grant goals and objectives.</p>	<p>27-31 pts</p> <p>The project fully addresses four of the five criteria for the “exemplary” rating, and the remaining items are mostly addressed, or can be addressed with technical assistance.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The project mostly, but not fully addresses all five of the criteria for the “exemplary” rating.</p>	<p>20-26 pts</p> <p>The project fully addresses three of the five criteria for the “exemplary” rating, and mostly addresses the remaining two criteria, or these items can be fully addressed with technical assistance.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The project somewhat addresses all five criteria outlined for an “exemplary” rating but may have some gaps or concerns.</p>	<p>0-19 pts</p> <p>The project fails to adequately address the five criteria outlined under “exemplary” in a direct or meaningful way.</p>

Rating Area	Exemplary	Good	Fair	Poor
<p>Project Risk Assessment (35 pts)</p> <p>Questions 16, 17 and 18</p> <p>(The primary focus of this rating area should be whether the project, as described, is likely to be completed by end of grant period.)</p>	<p>32-35 pts</p> <p>The project is well developed, the applicant is ready and capable, and there is a strong or certain chance of being completed on time.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Criteria:</p> <p>The applicant has adequate capacity to carry out the proposed project, including both staff and systems necessary to provide oversight, tracking, and compliance.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant clearly understands the scope and requirements of the project being proposed as demonstrated through a clear and reasonable timeline.</p>	<p>27-31 pts</p> <p>This project is mostly developed, with a few gaps. In general, this project has a reasonable chance of being completed successfully on time, but may require additional oversight, guidance, or technical support from the ICfL.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Criteria:</p> <p>The applicant has most of the systems and capacity necessary to carry out the project, but may need additional technical support, guidance, or oversight from ICfL to ensure success.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The applicant has a generally well-developed project, but there may be some areas that are underdeveloped or need work.</p>	<p>20-26 pts</p> <p>This project has several areas of concern. The project is underdeveloped, or the applicant lacks the capacity to carry out and oversee the project as described. The project would need significant oversight, guidance or technical support from the ICfL.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The project is well developed, and the applicant has the capacity to carry it out, but the timeline is not realistic, and the project is not likely to be substantially complete by the end of the grant period.</p>	<p>0-19 pts</p> <p>This project is significantly underdeveloped and lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate due diligence or understanding of the realities of the project.</p> <p>The proposed timeline is unreasonable or unlikely.</p> <p>The project has a high likelihood of being delayed, or otherwise encountering significant setbacks.</p>