

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

Agency:
Reviewer:

Funding Criteria	Exemplary	Adequate	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence	Points Awarded	Comments/Notes
1.1 Organizational Capacity: Applicant clearly demonstrates the capacity to serve and reach the priority population for the selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)	5-4 pts: Capacity is clearly outlined, existing infrastructure is described and leveraged for the selected project(s), description of reaching the priority population is well defined and includes innovation or new approaches.	3-2 pts: Capacity is defined and appropriate for the selected project(s), description of reaching the priority population for the proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) is included and described.	1 pt: Capacity to serve is minimally described and/or lack of sufficient detail to support ability to reach the priority population for the selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)	0 pts: No capacity described or specific potential to reach priority population described.		
1.2 Organizational Capacity: Applicant demonstrates the ability to follow all federal and state requirements.	3 pts: Ability to follow both federal and state requirements are demonstrated.	2 pts: Ability to follow federal or state requirements is included, but not both. Or ability to follow requirements lacks sufficient details.	N/A 0 pts: Ability to follow all requirements is not described.	0 pts: Ability to follow all requirements is not described.		
1.3 Organizational Capacity: Applicant demonstrates synergies between organizational mission and current Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan goals.	2 pts: selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) align with organizational goals and previous experience/similar work is described.	1pt: selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) align with organizational goals, no previous experience or similar work being conducted.	N/A 0 pts: Ability to follow all requirements is not described.	0 pts: No explicit relationship between selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and the mission of the organization.		

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

<p>2.1 Community Engagement: Applicant describes how community members or partners will be engaged or participate in proposed initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>	<p>4 pts: Clear description of community engagement in planning, implementing, and evaluating of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>	<p>3 pts: Community engagement is described for planning, implementing, or evaluating but not all three aspects.</p>	<p>1 pt: Community engagement is minimally described and/or lacks sufficient detail to determine the community's or partner's role in selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>	<p>0 pts: No community engagement is described.</p>		
<p>2.2 Community Engagement: Applicant identified relevant partnerships, coalitions, and/or collaborations that will contribute to the success of current Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan goals, objectives, projects, and or initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>	<p>3 pts: 5 or more partnerships, coalitions, or collaborations are identified and seem appropriate for selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>	<p>2 pts: 3-4 partnerships, coalitions, or collaborations are identified and seem appropriate for selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>	<p>1 pt: 1-2 partnerships, coalitions, or collaborations are identified and seem appropriate for selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), additional partners may be identified but not relevant to the proposed work.</p>	<p>0 pts: No partnerships, coalitions, or collaborations are identified that are relevant to the selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>		
<p>2.3 Community Engagement: Applicant demonstrates a commitment to engaging community members in previous or current work.</p>	<p>3 pts: Clear description of community member engagement in previous or current work including how members are engaged.</p>	<p>2 pts: Assurance of community members in previous or current work.</p>	<p>1 pt: Minimal description of community engagement in current or previous work.</p>	<p>0 pts: No engagement of community members in current or previous work, or insufficient detail to determine engagement.</p>		

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

<p>3.1 Populations Served: Applicant qualified sites and participants for SNAP-Ed services</p>	<p>5 pts: Thorough demonstration of the applicant's process for qualifying geographies, sites, and participants for SNAP-Ed services, including clear criteria and procedures.</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Adequate description of the applicant's approach to qualifying geographies, sites, and participants, with <i>some</i> details on criteria and procedures.</p>	<p>2 pts: Minimal information provided on the applicant's process for qualifying geographies, sites and participants, with <i>vague or unclear</i> criteria and procedures.</p>	<p>0 pts: No evidence of the applicant's ability to qualify sites and participants for SNAP-Ed services, with <i>no clear</i> criteria or procedures outlined.</p>		
<p>3.2 Populations Served: Applicant describes the populations that will be served by current Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan selected project(s) and or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>	<p>10-9 pts: Comprehensive description covering all aspects of the populations to be served, including clear methods for identifying and recruiting the target population, precise physical locations of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), detailed geographic locations, and an accurate estimate of the number of people to be served by each selected project.</p>	<p>8-6 pts: Thorough description of the populations to be served, with clear methods for identifying and recruiting the target population, specific physical locations of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), and some geographic locations provided, along with a reasonable estimate of the number of people to be served by each selected project.</p>	<p>5-3 pts: Adequate description of the populations to be served, with basic information on methods for identifying and recruiting the target population, general physical locations of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), and minimal geographic locations provided, along with a rough estimate of the number of people to be served by each selected project.</p>	<p>2-0 pts: Minimal description of the populations to be served, with little information on methods for identifying and recruiting the target population, unclear physical locations of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), and insufficient geographic locations provided, along with no or inaccurate estimate of the number of people to be served by each selected project</p>		
<p>4.1 Initiative(s)/Activity(s) Proposed: Applicant describes a reasonable and well-developed proposed evidence-based initiative(s)/activity(s) that align with their organizational capacity, the State Plan, their community needs, and with DGA, My Plate, and the PAG.</p>	<p>10-8 pts: Clear alignment between proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and the current Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan, existing organizational capacity and infrastructure. Strong rationale and significance of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) under this NOFO/RFA.</p>	<p>7-5 pts: Proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) require additional capacity or infrastructure investments that do not currently exist but are reasonable, rationale. Significance of proposed work is general but still appropriate, proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>	<p>4-2 pts: Current capacity or infrastructure cannot support proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and necessary organizational investments do not appear reasonable. Weak presentation of rationale and significance of proposed work, most of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) are allowable under the RFP.</p>	<p>1-0 pts: Unconvincing or no evidence indicating capacity and infrastructure support for proposed initiative(s)/activity(s). No rationale or significance of work presented; majority of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) are unallowable.</p>		

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

		are allowable under the RFP.				
<p>4.2 Initiative(s)/Activity(s) Proposed: Applicant describes how proposed staffing plan supports the implementation of each initiative(s)/activity(s) and projected reach.</p>	<p>5 pts: Personnel are congruent with selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and projected reach for each initiative(s)/activity(s) and projected reach is clearly defined for each proposed project initiative(s)/activity(s) and appears reasonable for the local context and funded FTE.</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Deficiencies or overestimations exist in personnel or projected reach for each selected project(s) and/or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) but not both. Projected reach is defined for each selected project or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) but may be over or under estimated based on local context and funded FTE.</p>	<p>2-1 pts: Deficiencies or overestimations exist in personnel and projected reach for each initiative(s)/activity(s). Projected reach is defined for some initiative(s)/activity(s) but not all, all projected reach appears to be over or under estimation based on local context and funded FTE.</p>	<p>0 pts: Insufficient information about personnel and projected reach to gauge feasibility. Projected reach is not included for any proposed initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>		
<p>4.3 Initiative(s)/Activity(s) Proposed: Collaboration and coordination internally and with other organizations is clearly described.</p>	<p>5 pts: Internal and external collaborations are clearly defined and aligned with selected project(s) and initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Some internal and external collaborations are overlooked but the collaborations described are redeemable.</p>	<p>2-1 pts: Selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) are isolated from internal and external collaborations.</p>	<p>0 pts: Lack of sufficient detail to judge how internal and external collaborations will support selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>		
<p>4.4 Initiative(s)/Activity(s) Proposed: Applicant demonstrates how the initiative(s)/activity(s) relate to Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan goals and objectives.</p>	<p>5 pts: Clear demonstration of alignment between selected project or initiative(s)/activity(s) and SNAP-Ed priorities, with evidence provided</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Some alignment between selected project or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and SNAP-Ed priorities, but lacking clear evidence or explanation.</p>	<p>2 pts: Minimal demonstration of alignment between selected project or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and SNAP-Ed priorities, with little to no evidence provided.</p>	<p>0 pts: No demonstration of alignment between selected project or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) and SNAP-Ed priorities.</p>		

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

<p>5.1 Evaluation: Applicant clearly demonstrates capacity to carry out data collection and evaluation requirements.</p>	<p>5 pts: Clear depiction of capacity and/or previous experience collecting necessary data.</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Good understanding of data requirements but plan lacks some detail about data collection capacity or previous experience collecting similar types of data.</p>	<p>2-1 pts: Capacity to collect data is difficult to ascertain.</p>	<p>0 pts: Data collection capacity missing.</p>		
<p>5.2 Evaluation: Applicant describes how proposed staff plan supports the evaluation of each initiative(s)/activity(s).</p>	<p>5 pts: Comprehensive description of how the proposed staff plan directly supports the evaluation of each initiative(s)/activity(s), including clear roles and responsibilities assigned to staff members, specific tasks related to data collection, analysis, and reporting, and a well-defined plan for coordination among staff members to ensure effective evaluation implementation.</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Adequate description of how the proposed staff plan supports the evaluation of each initiative(s)/activity(s), with some clarity on roles and responsibilities assigned to staff members, general tasks related to data collection, analysis, and reporting outlined, and a basic plan for coordination among staff members to facilitate evaluation activities</p>	<p>2-1 pts: Minimal description of how the proposed staff plan supports the evaluation of each initiative(s)/activity(s), with little to no clarity on roles and responsibilities assigned to staff members, unclear or absent tasks related to data collection, analysis, and reporting, and no plan outlined for coordination among staff members to facilitate evaluation efforts.</p>	<p>0 pts: No description of how the proposed staff plan supports the evaluation of each initiative(s)/activity(s), with little to no clarity on roles and responsibilities assigned to staff members, unclear or absent tasks related to data collection, analysis, and reporting, and no plan outlined for coordination among staff members to facilitate evaluation efforts.</p>		

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

<p>6.1 Potential Impact: Applicant describes the potential impact implementing the proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) will have on its community and/or individuals.</p>	<p>10-9 pts: Comprehensive description of impact in the geographies of implementation, including projections of impacted individuals through all initiative(s)/activity(s) proposed. There is a clear description indicating a deep understanding of the potential effects with high relevance to the needs of the community/individual and innovation in proposing solutions to community needs/assets.</p>	<p>8-6 pts: Detailed description of impact in the geographies of implementation, including projections of impacted individuals through all initiative(s)/activity(s) proposed but projections may be unrealistic or lofty. There is description indicating an understanding of the potential effects with some relevance to the needs of the community/individual and solutions address community needs/assets.</p>	<p>5-3 pts: Superficial description of impact in the geographies of implementation, but projections of impacted individuals through all initiative(s)/activity(s) is lacking or insufficient. There is some understanding of the potential effects with minor relevance to the needs of the community/individual. Initiative(s)/activity(s) are not proposed as solutions to address community needs/assets.</p>	<p>2-0 pts: Very little description of impact in the geographies is present. There are no projections of impacted individuals through all initiative(s)/activity(s). Very little understanding of the potential effects demonstrated. Impact of initiative(s)/activity(s) on community needs/assets is omitted.</p>		
<p>7.1 Budget: Budget narrative is broken out by selected project.</p>	<p>5 pts: Budget narrative by selected project is included; all expenditures are accurate, allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary; all items have sufficient explanation to justify the request.</p>	<p>4-3 pts: Budget narrative by selected project is included; all expenditures are accurate, allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary; deficiencies or overestimations exist in the budget, but selected project(s) seem achievable; most items have sufficient explanation to justify the request.</p>	<p>2-1 pts: Budget narrative is not broken out by selected project; most but not all items are accurate, allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary; deficiencies or overestimations exist in the budget exposing a weakness in the plan; insufficient explanation to justify the request.</p>	<p>0 pts: Insufficient information about budget narrative by selected project and justifications; majority of items are not accurate, allowable, allocable, reasonable, and necessary.</p>		

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

<p>7.2 Budget Applicant describes how the total proposed budget will support the successful implementation of proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) by selected project(s).</p>	<p>10-9 pts: Clear justification of projected expenses and their alignment with selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), all calculations are provided and appear reasonable, personnel costs are clearly described and justified related to selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>	<p>8-6 pts: Projected expenses appear to generally align with selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), all calculations are provided, personnel costs seem generally related to the selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) but appear reasonable.</p>	<p>5-3 pts: Narrative lacks specificity to determine if projected expenses align with selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), most calculations are provided but some are omitted, personnel is not clearly justified with selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s)</p>	<p>1-0 pts: Insufficient detail included in the narrative to determine if the projected expenses align with the selected project(s) or proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), calculations are omitted or unreasonable, personnel justifications are omitted.</p>		
<p>7.3 Budget: Applicant includes necessary items for proposed initiative(s)/activity(s) implementation (e.g., training travel, educational materials, program licenses, etc.)</p>	<p>3 pts: Inclusion of all necessary items to implement SNAP-Ed initiative(s)/activity(s) and comply with expectations of Nevada SNAP-Ed.</p>	<p>2 pts: Majority of requirements are included, but budget omitted one or two items.</p>	<p>N/A 0 pts: Ability to follow all requirements is not described.</p>	<p>0 pts: Budget omits more than two necessary items to implement SNAP-Ed initiative(s)/activity(s) and comply with expectations of Nevada SNAP-Ed.</p>		
<p>7.4 Budget: Additional documentation is provided, as needed.</p>	<p>2 pts: Federally negotiated indirect cost agreement is provided, if applicable; rental/lease agreements are provided, if applicable; the application states if additional budget documents are not required.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>1 pt: One piece of documentation is missing based on budget justification.</p>	<p>0 pts: Missing all additional documentation based on budget justification.</p>		

Final Score: _____
 Overall Rank: _____
 Outstanding

FFY25 Nevada SNAP-Ed Application Scored Criteria

Application excels in nearly all aspects of the evaluation criteria. It demonstrates exemplary organizational capacity, community engagement, alignment with the Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan, comprehensive proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), thorough evaluation planning, potential for significant impact, and a well-justified budget. This application showcases innovation, clear planning, strong community partnerships, a deep understanding of the target population's needs, and a thorough grasp of SNAP-Ed at the federal and state level.

High Priority

Application meets most of the evaluation criteria effectively. While there may be some areas where improvements could be made, overall, the application demonstrates adequate organizational capacity, community engagement, alignment with Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan, reasonable proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), evaluation planning, potential impact, and a reasonably justified budget. An understanding of SNAP-Ed at the federal and state level is demonstrated throughout the proposal. This application shows promise and potential for success but may have minor deficiencies or areas for enhancement.

Medium Priority:

Application meets the minimum requirements for consideration but has noticeable gaps or weaknesses in certain areas. While it may have strengths in some respects, there are notable deficiencies in organizational capacity, community engagement, alignment with Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan, reasonable proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), evaluation planning, potential impact, or budget justification. The understanding of SNAP-Ed at the federal and state level is not clearly demonstrated. This application may require significant improvements or revisions to be competitive.

Low Priority:

Application falls short in multiple critical areas and may not meet the minimum requirements for consideration. It demonstrates insufficient organizational capacity, weak community engagement, poor alignment with Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan, inadequate proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), evaluation planning, potential impact, or budget justification. An understanding of SNAP-Ed at the federal and state level is not apparent. This application lacks essential elements necessary for successful implementation and may not be feasible without substantial revisions.

Do not fund:

Application fails to meet the necessary requirements and is not recommended for funding. It demonstrates significant deficiencies or omissions across all evaluation criteria, including organizational capacity, community engagement, alignment with Nevada SNAP-Ed State Plan, proposed initiative(s)/activity(s), evaluation planning, potential impact, and budget justification. This application does not align with program goals and lacks the essential components for successful implementation.