**Scoring Sheet and Reviewer Instructions:**

1. Reviewers will evaluate each proposal for five specific criteria, or RFP elements:
2. Current CIT program strength and status
3. Strategic plan for assessment site
4. Budget and budget narrative
5. Reporting requirements and data
6. RFP submission instruction compliance
7. Reviewers are asked to provide comments substantiating the rating score per element. Please refer to the descriptive bulleted items for each element, the RFP, and the Essential Elements guidelines to justify your scoring (points). The five review criteria are topical in nature. Significant information requested for each category may be found throughout the application and should be taken into consideration when rating each element, regardless of the particular application section in which it is found. The ratings levels are described below:

| **Rating** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| Exceptional  (4 points) | Exceeds requirements and demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the criteria set forth: One or more major strengths exist; no significant weaknesses exist. |
| Acceptable  (3 points) | Demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the criteria set forth: There may be some notable weaknesses, however strengths outweigh the weaknesses. |
| Marginal  (2 points) | Demonstrates a fair understanding of the criteria set forth: There are one or more notable weaknesses which do not outweigh demonstrated strengths that are identified; weaknesses will be difficult to correct. |
| Unacceptable  (1 point) | Fails to demonstrate an understanding of the criteria set forth: There are one or more significant weaknesses that will be very difficult to correct or are not correctable; no strengths are identified to offset these weaknesses. |

1. To create a proposal’s overall score, each of the 5 elements’ scores will be totaled and averaged. The average score will serve as that proposal’s overall score, or independent reviewer rating.
2. After each proposal is independently scored, members of the RFP Review Committee will convene on August 10, 2012, at 8:45 a.m. (12th Floor Conference Room – DBHDS) to discuss the individual and relative merits of each proposal, which may include requests for and/or sharing of additional information. Reviewers may choose to retain their original scores or modify their scores as a result of the group’s discussion. The final score for each element must include detailed comments that describe the rationale leading to the score assigned.
3. Once the individual scoring for an applicant is finalized, each reviewer will submit their scores to be averaged with the other reviewer scores and a final ranking of the proposal will be assigned.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applicant: Henrico Area Mental Health and Developmental Services** | **Reviewer: Jana Braswell** | **Date:8.2.12** |
| **RFP Elements** | **Comments** | **Rating (1-4)** |
| 1. Current CIT program strength and status  * Meets CIT Essential Elements   + Training   + MOUs, Policies and Procedures   + Coordinator   + Task Force and oversight   + Data * Meets statutory goals for CIT * Current operational status * Demonstrates collaboration and leadership |  | 4 |
| 1. Strategic plan for assessment site  * Location, service area, capacity * Partners, stakeholders, roles described * Demonstrates collaboration and leadership * Planning process described * Site utilization plan included (functionality) * Site modifications described * Projected operational date included * EBP’s, programs and supports described * Additional resources available described * Ongoing oversight plan detailed * MOUs, policies and procedures included * Any anticipated barriers discussed * Complies with CIT Essential Elements | The Crisis Receiving Center (CRC) will be housed at Henrico Hospital (Parham) and staffed by CIT trained officers, and have clinicians and peer counselor’s available 24/7/365.The hospital has also agreed to a no diversion policy for referrals from CIT trained first responders. They have also designed and built two ‘safe rooms’ for law enforcement referrals. I also like how they are employing the use of peer counselors at the crisis center. Henrico does a very thorough job describing their strategic plan and responding to each of the bullets under this element. They even describe the EBP’s they will employ and emphasize delivering a message of ‘hope’ and ‘recovery’. This is a very strong proposal and a very well planned CRC. | 4 |
| 1. Budget and budget narrative  * Reasonable, realistic, practical * Amount will allow more sites to be funded * Matching funds   + 5% first year build out   + 20% FY13   + 30% FY14 * Anticipated income * Narrative explanations, detail, justification | $292,162 requested. Very pleased to see they wrote in funds for data collection and assistant (20 hours per week). Budget looks good. | 4 |
| 1. Reporting requirements, data, outcomes  * Signed statement (?) * Data elements to be collected identified * Data collection and reporting process * Projected site outcomes described | They currently collect and compile CIT data which is sent to VCU’s statistical sciences and operations research department to be analyzed. This relationship with VCU is very impressive and they use data reports to drive decision making (which is an EBP). They plan to work with this group at VCU to plan an experimental design (not clear if they meant to say an experimental evaluation study?) and data collection system. They will be collecting the data elements from the essential elements as well as a number of other data elements. They will also include a poll regarding individuals experience with the CRC, which is GREAT. They do a very thorough job describing the elements they will collect and the strategy for collecting them. The CIT tracking form is also very impressive. | 4 |
| 1. RFP submission instruction compliance  * Timely * Application form utilized * Page limit adherence * Letters of support * Other technical requirements followed[[1]](#endnote-1) | The RFP submission was complete. | 4 |
| 1. Other Comments | This is a VERY strong proposal. Henrico appears to have a strong and well established CIT program, a strong data collection/analysis strategy, and substantial collaborative relationships and oversight. I think this program should be funded the full amount requested. | |
| **Total Score (Sum of RFP Element Ratings / 5 = Total Score)** | |  |

1. E.g., *All documents* shall utilize one inch margins, shall be in 12 point Times New Roman font and may be single spaced (does not apply to letters of support); *All pages* shall be numbered sequentially, excluding letters of support and addenda, which may be separately identified and paginated; Letters of support shall be signed and on agency or individual letterhead; Documents submitted must be named and saved as follows: **FY13-FY14 CIT ‘Drop-Off Center’ Funding Application – (Name of CSB)** [↑](#endnote-ref-1)