Summary of RFP #20-26JUN24

Background

The Boone County Children's Services Board (BCCSB) released the 2024 Open Request for Proposal (RFP) through the Boone County Purchasing Department on May 14, 2024. The Purpose Statement and Proposal Expectations in the RFP stated, "BCCSB desires to invest in meaningful programs which promote the well-being of children, youth, and strengthens families. The BCCSB believes that it should invest in meaningful services to children, youth, and families in a way that utilizes multiple effective strategies. Proposals will be considered for any statutorily eligible service area." The 2024 Open RFP allowed for programs funded through the end of December 31, 2024 to reapply for funding and new programs to apply. The initial term for potential contracts will be January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025 with the negotiated contract having an option for an additional two (2), one-year renewals. The total funding amount available for all programs potentially contracted through December 31, 2025 is a total of $10,000,000.00.

The RFP outlined instructions on how to submit proposals on Apricot, a web-based funding management system utilized by the Boone County Community Services Department (BCCSD). Apricot experienced prolonged technical difficulties during while the RFP was open for submitting proposals. The BCCSD provided alternative methods that met the Boone County Purchasing Department's requirements and extended the submission due date. Adjustments and instructions were released by the Boone County Purchasing Department through addendums.

The BCCSB and BCCSD followed the strict guidelines of the Boone County Purchasing Department throughout the RFP process. All communication was required to go through the Boone County Purchasing Department until all proposals have been denied or have executed contracts. Records remain confidential until the award recommendations were approved by the Boone County Commission. The RFP and released addendums can be found on the Boone County Purchasing Department's website under Closed Bids: https://www.showmeboone.com/purchasing/#.

RFP Timeline

The BCCSB approved the RFP language at their board meeting on April 11, 2024 and the RFP evaluation process on June 13, 2024. The following diagram outlines the evaluation process:



The RFP evaluation process followed the following timeline to allow for contract execution by December 31, 2025:

Task:	Timeline:
RFP Release Date	May 14, 2024
RFP Response Submission Deadline	Original: June 26, 2024 Adjusted: June 28, 2024
BCCSD staff read all proposals to provide recommendations BCCSB	July 31, 2024
BCCSB review executive summaries and/or full proposals	August 2024
BCCSB Review Committees discuss and score proposals	Late August-Early September 2024
BCCSB determine which proposals to pursue negotiations and proposals not to fund	September 12, 2024
Written clarifications and negotiations sent to organizations the BCCSB is interested in funding	Mid-September-Early November 2024
Best and Final Offers reviewed and approved by BCCSB	November 14, 2024
Agreement Forms and contracts developed for programs approved for funding	Mid-November-Mid-December 2024
First reading for RFP award recommendations read in Boone County Commission	December 17, 2024
Second reading for RFP award recommendations read in Boone County Commission	December 19, 2024

RFP Offerors

The RFP received 69 proposals from 54 different organizations/departments. See **Attachment A** of the list of offerors and proposal titles read in the Boone County Commission on July 9th, 2024. The total amount requested was $18,529,440.91.

Evaluation Process

The proposals were reviewed by multiple BCCSD staff members and organized into five categories:

- **Infant and Early Childhood Programs**
- **School-Based Programs**

- **Youth and Family Support Programs**
- **Treatment Programs**
- **Community Support and Basic Needs Programs**

The BCCSB Review Committees were aligned with these categories. Due to the high volume of submissions, two committees were formed specifically for Youth and Family Support Programs. Each committee typically consisted of three BCCSB members, with some members serving on multiple committees.

The committees evaluated and scored proposals based on the following criteria:

- Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?
- Does the proposal address identify community needs?
- Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?
- Does the proposal improve equitable access to services?
- Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?
- Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?
- Does the proposal adhere to the guidelines outlined in the RFP?

Committee meetings were held prior to the September 12th BCCSB meeting to discuss and score assigned proposals. Scores and recommendations were then presented at the board meeting, where the BCCSB decided which proposals to fund and which to decline. The committee scores are detailed in **Attachment B**. Organizations whose proposals were not selected for initial review were notified after the September meeting to assist with their planning.

The BCCSB noted that many proposals included high funding requests. Several reapplications requested increases of approximately $100,000 or double their current contracted amounts, while new program proposals also included significant funding requests. As a result, the BCCSB decided to request most proposals to reduce their funding amounts during contract negotiations. Proposals seeking renewed funding were asked to align their Best and Final Offer (BAFO) with their current contract levels. However, exceptions were made for programs directly addressing early childcare, after-school programming, and housing-related support, allowing these programs to increase their BAFO to meet heightened community needs.

Contract Negotiations

The BCCSD staff sent Written Clarifications through the Boone County Purchasing Department that includes questions while reviewing proposals, correcting program details, and negotiating program services. The Written Clarifications also required organizations to submit their BAFO based on feedback and clarification questions from the BCCSD and BCCSB. The BAFOs were presented to the BCCSB to discuss and vote on at the November 14th BCCSB meeting. The BCCSB approved funding 50 proposals across 40 different organizations/departments. See **Attachment C** of the memo read in the Boone County Commission listing the organizations, programs, contracted amount, and summary of the program. **Attachment B** also includes the evaluation sheets for the BCCSB Review Committees. The total amount contracted for FY2025 through the 2024 Open RFP is $9,171,811.57. Following the BCCSB's approval, the BCCSD created Agreement Forms that

included the final agreed upon program budget, consumer demographics, performance measures, and program services descriptions and outputs. The Agreement Form became part of the contract documentation. Contracts were sent to organizations by the Boone County Purchasing Department with the goal of being fully executed by December 31, 2024.

Next Steps

Contracts began on January 1, 2025 allowing organizations to begin/continue delivering the contracted services. The contracts follow a Purchase of Service model which requires organizations to track units of service delivered as outlined in their Agreement Form. Organizations submit monthly invoices for the services they delivered.

The BCCSD will schedule site visits for each program contracted through the 2024 Open RFP. Site visits include reviewing required documentation and ensuring data tracking systems are built correctly. The BCCSB is informed of the site visits schedules and can attend the visit. The BCCSB is also kept informed of any concerns or issues that may arise throughout the contract period.

Organizations are required to submit Interim Reports for the period of January 1 through June 30 and a Year End Report for the period of January 1 through December 31 for each contract period. The BCCSB makes renewal decisions in the fall for ongoing funding for the next calendar year. The BCCSB takes into consideration the site visit, funding utilization, reporting, responsiveness to requests, and any other pertinent information.

The next Open RFP process is tentatively scheduled for 2027. Historically, the BCCSB has released targeted RFPs in the year(s) an Open RFP isn't released. However, the fund balance and sustainability of the Children's Services Fund must be taken into consideration for future funding opportunities. Interested parties are encouraged to register as a vendor with the Boone County Purchasing Department to receive notification of future funding opportunities.

Questions regarding the RFP and/or future funding opportunities can be directed to the BCCSD by calling (573)886-4298 or emailing communityservices@boonecountymo.org.

Attachment A

List of Offerors for RFP Opening: 20-26JUN24 – Purchase of Service Contract

Organization Name	Name of Program or Project
Bethany Christian Services of Missouri	Safe Families for Children
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Missouri	One-on-One Mentoring with BBBS
Boy Scouts of America Great Rivers Council	Great Rivers Council Scoutreach Program
Boys & Girls Clubs of the Columbia Area	Great Futures Start Here
Catholic Charities of Central and Northern Missouri	Mentoring All Refugee Kids (MARK) Program
Central Missouri Community Action	BRIDGE Program
Central Missouri Foster Care & Adoption Association(CMFCAA)	Family Crisis Stabilization Program
Central Missouri Foster Care & Adoption Association(CMFCAA)	Respite Care Odyssey Events
CHA Low-Income Services, Inc.	Healthy Home Connections
CHA Low-Income Services, Inc.	Moving Ahead Afterschool and Summer Program
CHADS Coalition for Mental Health	CHADS School Outreach
City of Columbia	Columbia Public Schools Extended Partners Afterschool Programs
City of Columbia on behalf of its Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services	School-Based Influenza Vaccination Clinics
City of Refuge	City Preschool: Cross-Cultural Education
Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture	Farm to School
Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture	Opportunity Gardens
Columbia Farmers Market Inc.	Food Incentive Programming at Columbia Farmers Market: Access to Healthy Food & Produce Prescription Program
Columbia Supreme	Columbia Supreme Youth Mentoring Program
Community Playground of Columbia, Inc.	Fun City Youth Academy
Compass Health, Inc.	School Based Therapy
Connections to Success, Inc.	Families Pathway to Success
Cora Community Outreach	Cor Columbia
Coyote Hill	Family Stability Program
Destiny of H.O.P.E.	Youth Empowerment
Dream Tree Academy 573	DreamTreeAcademy 573 Youth Tank Program
First Chance for Children (FC4C)	Baby Bags
First Chance for Children (FC4C)	Baby U Home Visitation Program
First Chance for Children (FC4C)	Lend and Learn Programming and Toy Library
First Chance for Children (FC4C)	Safe C.R.I.B.S. Community Resources, Infant Beds, and Support

Fostering Life-Changing Opportunities	Flourish Forward
Fostering Life-Changing Opportunities	Flourish Prep Internship Program
Fresh Start Sober Living Programs	Fresh Start Family Reunification Program
Grade A Plus Incorporated	Out of School Program Staffing
Harrisburg Early Learning Center	Harrisburg Early Learning Center
Heart of Missouri CASA	CASA Child Advocacy
HeartSpace Clinic	Safe and Sound Protocol
Heriford House Foundation	No Family Left Behind (NFLB): An HHF Project
Jefferson City Area YMCA	Tri-Health Initiative
Job Point	AmeriCorps
Job Point	Boone County Builds Youth
Kingdom Konnections	Kingdom Konnections
KVC Behavioral Healthcare Missouri, Inc.	HOPE Program
Love Columbia Corp	Path Forward
L.O.V.E. Our Youth, Inc.	Rise & Thrive: Young Professionals Crafting Futures Beyond High School
Lutheran Family and Children's Services of Missouri	Counseling and Parenting Services
Mary Lee Johnston Community Learning Center	Early Childhood Services
Moberly Area Community College	Quality Childcare Initiative at MACC
Powerhouse Community Development Corporation	Healthy Choices
Rainbow House	Rainbow House Children's Emergency Shelter
River Relief Inc.	Mornings at the River 2025
School of Service d/b/a Access Arts	Youth Arts Program
Seed Success	Creating Healthy Outcomes with Positive Childhood Experiences (QHOPE)
The Curations of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Occupational Therapy)	SWIM: Swimming and Water Instruction Modified for Autism Spectrum Disorder
The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of Debora Bell, Ph.D. and the Psychological Services Clinic)	MU Psychological Services Clinic Center for Evidence-Based Youth Mental Health 2024
The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the College of Education and Human Development)	Parenting Foundations: A Toolkit of Integrated and Evidence-Based Supports for Parents and Caregivers
The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)	Boone County Early Childhood Coalition
The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)	Child Trauma Initiative of Boone County (CTI-BC)
The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)	ECPBS - Early Childhood Positive Behavior Support

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)	MU Bridge Program: School-Based Psychiatry
The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Division of General Pediatrics, Department of Child Health, and University of Missouri Health Care)	HealthySteps
The Food Bank for Central and Northeast Missouri, Inc.	Children's Supplemental Food Programs
The Food Bank for Central and Northeast Missouri, Inc.	The Food Bank Market Children & Families
True North of Columbia, Inc.	True North's Children's Program
United Cerebral Palsy Heartland	Providing Children High-Quality, Evidence-Based, and Transformative ABA Therapy in Engaging and Adaptive Environments
Voluntary Action Center	VAC Basic Needs Program
Woodhaven Learning Center	Afterschool Youth Program
Woodhaven Learning Center	EnCircle Technologies

Attachment B

See the following documentation for the Boone County Purchasing memorandum regarding RFP Award Recommendations: *20-26JUN24 – Purchase of Service Contracts*.

622 -2024

CERTIFIED COPY OF ORDER

STATE OF MISSOURI } **ea.**
County of Boone

December Session of the October Adjourned **Term. 20** 24

In the County Commission of said county, on the 19th **day of** December **20** 24

the following, among other proceedings, were had, viz:

Now on this day, the County Commission of the County of Boone does hereby approve the RFP Acknowledgement of Responses Received: RFP # 20-26JUN24 - Purchase of Service Contracts.

Done this 19th day of December 2024.

Kip Kendrick
Presiding Commissioner

Justin Aldred
District I Commissioner

Janet M. Thompson
District II Commissioner

ATTEST:

Brianna L. Lennon
Clerk of the County Commission

Boone County Purchasing

Melinda Bobbitt, CPPO, CPPB
Director of Purchasing

5551 S. Tom Bass Road
Columbia, MO 65201
Phone: (573) 886-4391

MEMORANDUM

TO: Boone County Commission
FROM: Melinda Bobbitt, CPPO, CPPB
DATE: December 17, 2024
RE: RFP Award Recommendation: *20-26JUN24 – Purchase of Service Contracts*

Request for Proposal *20-26JUN24 – Purchase of Service Contracts* closed on June 28, 2024. 67 proposal responses were received.

The evaluation committee consisted of Connie Leipard, Michele Kennett, Lynn Barnett, Rodney Dixon, Leigh Spence, Greg Grupe, Robert Aulgur, and Sebastián Martínez Valdivia. Attached are the evaluation committee's review sheets.

Invoices will be paid from department 2162 –CSF Program Funding, account 71106 – Contracted Services. The total amount funded from this award is $9,171,811.57. $14,500,000.00 is budgeted for 2025.

Following are the 50 programs that are being recommended for award for the period January 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025 with the option for two, one-year renewals:

Bethany Christian Services of Missouri - *Safe Families for Children*

$35,000.00

Contract #: C000899

Bethany Christian Services of Missouri provides respite services to families during a crisis to deter children from the entering the foster care system. Case managers assist families in developing and implementing a plan to improve the situation and reduce risk factors of abuse and neglect.

Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Missouri - *One-on-One Mentoring with BBBS*

$67,840.20

Contract #: C000902

Children participating in the program are matched with mentors to offer social, emotional, and academic support.

Boys and Girls Clubs of the Columbia Area - *Great Futures Start Here*

$299,999.34

Contract #: C000905

Boys and Girls Club provides after-school and summer programming designed to empower youth to excel in school, become good citizens, and lead healthy, productive lives.

Catholic Charities of Central and Northern Missouri - *Mentoring All Refugee Kids (MARK) Program*

$41,878.00

Contract #: C000911

The program provides weekly after-school youth mentoring program for refugee youth in partnership with the Newman Center's Mentoring for At-risk Youth program (MARK).

Central Missouri Community Action - *BRIDGE Program*

$444,120.00

Contract #: C000946

The BRIDGE program supports families experiencing poverty in the first few years of elementary school in collaboration with the children's teacher. The program helps build social-emotional skills within children and build resiliency in both children and parents. BRIDGE also provides training to teachers to understand the impact poverty has on child development and learning.

Central Missouri Foster Care and Adoption Association - *Respite Care Odyssey Events*

$20,523.20

Contract #: C000912

Odyssey provides respite events for children and youth who are in foster care or waiting to be adopted. The goal of the program is to decrease family stress, increase social skills, and strengthen relationships.

CHA Low-Income Services, Inc. - *Healthy Home Connections*

$118,367.00

Contract #: C000944

Healthy Home Connections provides families assisted through the Columbia Housing Authority with access to supportive services, to increase their household stability, well-being, and ability to maintain housing.

CHA Low-Income Services, Inc. - *Moving Ahead After School & Summer Program*

$199,997.50

Contract #: C000945

The Moving Ahead Program provides education enrichment for children and youth of families who participate in Columbia Housing Authority Housing Voucher program. The Boone County Children's Services Fund supports out-of-school programming for youth and support services for their parents.

City of Refuge - *City Preschool: Cross-Cultural Education*

$29,999.64

Contract #: C000915

City of Refuge provides a cross-cultural preschool classroom for children ages 3-5 years old. The program helps prepare children for kindergarten through in a teacher-guided and child-led environment.

Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture - *Farm to School*

$155,201.82

Contract #: C000916

The program provides nutrition and garden-based education to Columbia elementary schools and to youth community programming at their site located at the Agriculture Park.

Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture - *Opportunity Gardens*

$83,143.12

Contract #: C000917

CCUA teaches low-income families with children how to grow their own produce efficiently and how to prepare healthy meals through the Opportunity Gardens program.

Columbia Farmers Market, Inc. - *Food Incentive Programming at Columbia Farmers Market: Access to Healthy Food & Produce Prescription Program*

$190,638.70

Contract #: C000918

The program provides financial match for SNAP and WIC participants at the Columbia Farmer's Market. In addition, people with low-income that are at risk or currently have diet-related chronic diseases can receive a six-month "prescription" for fruits and vegetables at the Columbia Farmers Market by visiting the Family Health Center. The goal is to reduce health care use and expenses by increasing fruit and vegetable consumption and food security.

Community Playground of Columbia, Inc. - *Fun City Youth Academy*

$150,000.00

Contract #: C000919

Fun City Youth Academy provides after school programming and during the summer. The goal is to improve academic outcomes, promote healthy lifestyle choices, and strengthen family units for youth under the age of 19.

Compass Health, Inc. - *School Based Therapy*

$369,772.00

Contract #: C000921

The program identifies and engages students in need of mental health services by partnering with the schools. The program provides treatment planning, therapeutic interventions, and care coordination for children and youth and their families.

Cora Community Outreach - *Cor Columbia*

$219,994.28

Contract #: C000923

Cor serves male student athletes, working to transform futures by providing access to opportunities and resources students need to succeed. The goal of this program is to use academics, relationships, and life skills to help students create a pathway to a post-secondary plan and fulfilling life beyond high school.

Coyote Hill - *Family Stability Program*

$190,416.00

Contract #: C000927

Coyote Hill provides supervised visits for children placed outside of their home with their biological family. The program also provides support to foster and biological families.

Destiny of H.O.P.E. - *Youth Empowerment*

$150,208.24

Contract #: C000932

The program offers life skills classes in Columbia Public School buildings to students at risk of law enforcement involvement. The program is also offered to youth at the Juvenile Justice Center. The goal is to prevent involvement and recidivism in the juvenile justice system for youth.

First Chance for Children - *Baby Bags*

$94,306.00

Contract #: C000934

Baby Bags provides education and basic necessities to meet a family's developmental, physical and mental health needs. The goal is to strengthen families by developing protective factors and providing basic necessities during times in need.

First Chance for Children - *Baby U Home Visitation Program*

$207,335.00

Contract #: C000935

Baby U provides home visiting services to prepare children to be social, emotionally and academically ready for kindergarten. Parents are also given information on child development, access to resources and supporting healthy relationships.

First Chance for Children - *Safe C.R.I.B.S. Community Resources, Infant Beds, and Support*

$24,515.00

Contract #: C000937

The CRIBS program supports families leaving the hospital by providing basic health and safety items to care for a new baby. A trained educator offers home visiting to help meet a family's developmental, physical and mental health needs and encourage to participate in longer term home visitation programs.

First Chance for Children - *Lend and Learn Programming and Toy Library*

$86,500.00

Contract #: C000938

Lend and Learn Toy Libraries provide a safe and inclusive location for young children and their parents to explore toys that strengthen social-emotional, cognitive, motor, and language development. The goal of the program is to strengthen positive parenting skills, reduce social isolation, and ultimately lead to children being developmentally ready for kindergarten.

Fostering Life-Changing Opportunities - *Flourish Prep Internship Program*

$80,063.30

Contract #: C000940

The Flourish Prep Internship Program offers paid internships and includes professional development and supportive services. Funding from the Boone County Children's Services Fund supports case management offered to interns and host safe community events for youth. The goal is to improve economic and social mobility for marginalized youth.

Fresh Start Sober Living Programs - *Fresh Start Family Reunification Program*

$162,000.00

Contract #: C000947

The program supports parents recovering from a substance use disorder by providing case management, peer support, and home visiting. The goal is to help parents reunify with their children and maintain a healthy, stable home.

Grade A Plus Incorporated - *Out of School Program Staffing*

$95,344.00

Contract #: C000941

The program provides tutoring services to children in need of academic support. The goal of the program is to improve academic performance and reduce risk of falling behind academically.

Harrisburg Early Learning Center - *Harrisburg Early Learning Center*

$100,152.00

Contract #: C000933

The goal of Harrisburg Early Learning Center is to provide year-round services and affordable care for the children of northern Boone County. These services include social emotional screenings for the children in the early childhood program, quality and structured before- and after-school programming and summer enrichment programming for school-aged children.

Heart of Missouri CASA - *CASA Child Advocacy*

$250,785.00

Contract #: C000931

Heart of Missouri CASA provides child advocacy services for children involved in abuse and neglect court cases. Services are provided by trained volunteers to help find safe, permanent homes for children who have been abused or neglected.

HeartSpace Clinic - *Safe and Sound Protocol*

$154,190.00

Contract #: C000948

The Safe and Sound protocol targets auditory sensitivities found in those who have experienced trauma or traumatic stress to improve listening and social engagement behaviors.

Heriford House Foundation - *No Family Left Behind (NFLB): An HHF Project*

$421,297.66

Contract #: C000887

Th program delivers Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and a group therapy for youth at-risk or involved with the juvenile justice system.

Job Point - *AmeriCorps*

$114,189.96

Contract #: C000929

The program assists young adults obtain a high school diploma equivalency, leading to economic independence.

Job Point - *Boone County Builds Youth*

$139,902.80

Contract #: C000930

Students participating in the Boone County Builds Youth program are dually enrolled with their public school and Job Point. The public school provides core educational courses students need to earn their high school diploma. In addition, Job Point offers vocational certificate courses and job readiness training.

Kingdom Konnections – *Kingdom Konnections*

$108,869.60

Contract #: C000949

The program provides parent skills training to parents that have had their child(ren) removed from the home or at-risk of removal. The goal is to reduce risk of child abuse and neglect and reunification of families

KVC Behavioral Healthcare Missouri, Inc. – *HOPE Program*

$202,901.00

Contract #: C000928

The HOPE program provides prevention services for Boone County children and families prior to abuse, neglect, and/or traumatizing removal of a child from their home. The goal is to prevent child abuse and neglect, improve parent-child relationships, and reduce out-of-home placement.

Love Columbia Corp. - *Path Forward*

$225,057.21

Contract #: C000926

The program provides case management support to families with children that are experiencing housing insecurity. The goal is to connect families to services to enhance well-being and self-sufficiency.

Lutheran Family and Children's Services of Missouri - *Counseling and Parenting Services*

$418,377.95

Contract #: C000925

The program provides home visiting, therapy, parenting education, and case management services to parents, caregivers, and their children to increase timely access to pregnancy, parenting, and mental health services for families. The goal of the program is to decrease the number of children in the region who are at risk of child abuse and neglect.

Mary Lee Johnston Community Learning Center - *Early Childhood Services*

$94,645.86

Contract #: C000924

Mary Lee Johnston Community Learning Center (MLJCLC) provides enrolled families with case management and support to access resources. The goal is to prepare young children for kindergarten.

Moberly Area Community College - *The Quality Childcare Initiative at MACC*

$497,700.61

Contract #: C000922

MACC offers scholarships for childcare providers and high school students to obtain their Child Development Associate Credential. MACC also provides training and coaching in HighScope, an evidence-based curriculum for early childcare providers.

Powerhouse Community Development Corporation - *Healthy Choices*

$250,880.68

Contract #: C000920

The program provides school-based, after-school, and summer programming to youth with a focus on developing life skills, leadership development, and job readiness training. Parents are encouraged to participate in Parent Cafes designed to assist parents in navigating available resources and reduce parental stress.

School of Service (dba Access Arts) - *Youth Arts Program*

$76,116.48

Contract #: C000914

The program provides art programming afterschool to Benton Elementary School students, six-week classes, and art camps for students. The program provides access to art programming to children from low-income households, children with disabilities, or children that face other barriers to quality art programming.

The Curations of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Occupational Therapy) - *SWIM: Swimming and Water Instruction Modified for Autism Spectrum Disorder*

$30,736.32

Contract #: C000913

The SWIM program teaches water safety and swimming skills to children with autism spectrum disorder by providing affordable, adapted group swim lessons.

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of Debora Bell, Ph.D. and the Psychological Services Clinic) - *MU Psychological Services Clinic Center for Evidence-Based Youth Mental Health 2024*

$375,570.02

Contract #: C000910

The program provides evidence-based assessment and treatment for children, adolescents, and their families for a variety of emotional and behavioral difficulties.

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry) - *Boone County Early Childhood Coalition*

$231,136.66

Contract #: C000908

The Boone County Early Childhood Coalition (BCECC) serves families through Triple P, an evidence-based intervention model which increases knowledge, skills, and confidence of parents to reduce the prevalence of mental health, emotional, and behavioral problems in children. BCECC also supports collaboration and capacity building for early childhood professionals.

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry) – *Child Trauma Initiative of Boone County (CTI-BC)*

$181,962.72

Contract #: C000909

The program provides interventions for children and/or their parents, families, or caregivers who have experienced one of more traumatic events.

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry) – *ECPBS – Early Childhood Positive Behavior Support*

$333,939.80

Contract #: C000907

The program provides training and professional coaching to early childhood professionals that supports social-emotional development for young children.

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry) - *MU Bridge Program: School-Based Psychiatry*

$758,645.79 estimated

Contract #: TBD

The MU Bridge Program provides school-based psychiatric services and nurse case management for Boone County Children and adolescents who are in need of psychiatry services. The goal of the program is to decrease the wait time for school-age children to access psychiatry services.

The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Division of General Pediatrics, Department of Child Health, and University of Missouri Health Care) - *HealthySteps*

$175,559.00

Contract #: C000906

HealthySteps for Young Children connects with families during pediatric well visits as part of the primary care team. They offer screenings, help with complex parenting issues, guidance and referrals, care coordination, and home visits.

The Food Bank for Central & Northeast Missouri, Inc. - *The Food Bank Market Children & Families*

$119,998.61

Contract #: C000950

The Food Bank Market provides food and groceries to those in need in Boone County. The goal of this program is to reduce food insecurity by providing supplemental food to low-income individuals in Boone County and increase access to nutritious foods by distributing foods such as fresh produce, protein and dairy.

The Food Bank for Central & Northeast Missouri, Inc. - *Children's Supplemental Food Programs*

$49,998.60

Contract #: C000951

The program provides supplemental food to students in school buildings. Pantries are located on school grounds to allow for a more readily accessible food source for students and their families that have low-income.

True North of Columbia, Inc. - *True North's Children's Program*

$42,054.90

Contract #: C000904

The program provides Trust-Based Relational Intervention (TBRI) to children and their parents who are survivors of domestic and/or sexual violence who typically reside in True North's residential emergency shelter. The goal is to increase emotional resiliency and promote healthy attachments.

Voluntary Action Center - *VAC Basic Needs Program*

$148,000.00

Contract #: C000903

The program provides a variety of services that specifically address and meet needs for assistance with health, employment, and safety for low-income Boone County residents.

Woodhaven Learning Center - *EnCircle Technologies*

$151,980.00

Contract #: C000901

Woodhaven empowers people with developmental disabilities to succeed by assisting them in their own homes and supporting them as they work, volunteer and form relationships in the community. The program provides job training in technical careers to individuals with disabilities through the age of 19. Woodhaven meets with local businesses to hire individuals with disabilities.

cc: Proposal File

ATT Evaluation Committee Reports and Score Sheets

Organization: City of Refuge

City Preschool

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**City Preschool**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides childcare targeting refugee/immigrant families.
Does the proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	Access to childcare is a critical in the community. The program hours extremely limiting to fully address childcare access for the families being served. Clarification is needed on if the location is accessible for the target population.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program recently opened and is a new service provided by the organization.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program is serving refugee/immigrant families but also serves families outside of this population. The hours limit the impact access to childcare can have for the population.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The funding request was reduced. The program has multiple funding streams and actively pursuing childcare subsidy. The request is 22% of the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program is to help clients access programs offered by City of Refuge and other organizations. The program has librarians come to the center and take field trips to the library. The program is using resources to develop the curriculum.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	27.00	20.00	76.00	

Organization: First Chance for Children

Baby Bags
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Baby Bags**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program offers basic need items to families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to basic need items is a critical need. The proposal is serving an extremely higher amount of individuals but needs clarification.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been provided for several years and continues to grow.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program is provided to anyone needing services. The program doesn't limit to a specific income level or target any particular population.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has multiple funding streams but prioritizies CSF for Boone County residents. The funding request and unit rates increased significantly compared to the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization distributes diapers and basic need items through multiple partners across the community. The MOUs were not provided.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Total Score	**28.00**	**20.00**	**83.00**	

Organization: First Chance for Children

Baby U

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Baby U**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides home visiting to families with infants and toddlers.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps teach positive parenting skills to reduce the risk for child abuse and neglect.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been delivered for several years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	Majority of the families are at or below 200% FPL. The program uses risk factors to determine eligibility for the program.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request and unit rate increased but is serving fewer families. CSF is majority of the program budget (91%).
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program mentions collaborating with Brighter Beginnings but needs more information.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Raw Score	**25.00**	**20.00**	**75.00**	

Organization: First Chance for Children

Lend and Learn

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Lend and Learn**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides positive activities for families. The hours are limiting but are occassionally open in the evening.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program does not directly address critical needs in the community. The program shows fewer individuals will be served compared to the current contract.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has experience providing the program.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program is open to all families. There are events that are scheduled for specific populations or interest groups.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased significantly. Fewer individuals will be served despite a large increase in funding. CSF is 85% of the program budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program collaborates to provide Mornings at the River and several other organizations. No MOUs were provided.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Raw Score	**22.00**	**20.00**	**62.00**	

Organization: First Chance for Children

Safe CRIBS

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Safe CRIBS			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides cribs to families with infants and home visiting to teach parenting skills.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	A safe place to sleep is a critical need for families with newborns. The program also provides home visiting to teach positive parenting skills to reduce the risk for child abuse and neglect.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been offered for several years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program receives referrals for families that do not have a safe space for newborns to sleep. All the individuals will be at or below 200% FPL. The proposal has a diverse clientele.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The funding request amount and unit rates increased significantly but will serve few individuals and number of units. The request to CSF is 61% of the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program collaborates with other organizations to distribute cribs. No MOUs were provided.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Raw Score	28.00	20.00	84.00	

Organization: Harrisburg Early Learning Center

Harrisburg Early Learning Center

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Harrisburg Early Learning Center			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides out of school programming and early childcare.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program is located in a rural community and meets a criticial need.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been offered for a long time and has experience administering screenings.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program is in a rural community and is a childcare desert. Half of the individuals are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization increased the funding request to CSF but has historically kept the same contract amount. The unit rate for Out of School Programming increased significantly and should be comparable to similar programming. The program has diverse funding streams.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program utilizes services from ECPBS and refers families to other services when needed.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	32.00	20.00	91.00	

Organization: Mary Lee Johnston Community Learning Center

Early Childhood Services

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Early Childhood Services**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides childcare to families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to childcare is a critical issue in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has had difficulty staying open and overcoming long term organizational issues.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves a diverse population and majority are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request significantly increased to CSF and is 27% of the budget. The rate for Early Childhood Education does not seem to be sustainable. The program has multiple funding streams but did not include Heart of Missouri United Way.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal lists different resources and referrals offered to parents. The organization has tried developing relationships with other organizations to enhance services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not follow instructions. Attachments were not provided and did not follow the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	**23.00**	**20.00**	**72.00**	

Organization: River Relief Inc.

Mornings at the River
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Mornings at the River			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program provides activities for families with young children. The program is only offered six times in the summer. The proposal does not describe any quality standards in how lessons/activities are developed.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program does not meet critical needs of families.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has been offered for a couple years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The location is a barrier for families that have limited transportation or financial means to travel to a rural location. The program is open to anyone and does not target any specific population.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request is 88% of the budget. There are a couple other funding sources. There may be a duplication of funding since First Chance for Children collaborates through the Lend and Learn Libraries. The MOU states FC4C would be reimbursed for their expenses.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program appears to have a positive relationship with a local business to offer the space at no charge. The organization collaborates with other organizations to enhance educational activities.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal did not follow all the instructions.
Score	14.00	20.00	39.00	

Organizations: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the College of Education and Human Development)

Parenting Foundations

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Parenting Foundations**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	1.00	4.00	4.00	The program will only be provided online and does not provide support to families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	Parenting skills education is needed but not in the method of delivery that is proposed.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	0.00	2.00	0.00	The program does not currently exist. The proposal does not provide specific information on the curriculum and quality that will be used to develop the program.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The program would serve parents that are at risk for child abuse and neglect but lacks specific information on how they would be referrred or supported. Families may not have access to the program since it's online. The demographics were not completed correctly and show the whole county.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request is extremly high. The program would be a pilot but with the intention to expand statewide.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The program lists potential referral sources but does not demonstrate collaboration to enhance services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal did not follow all the instructions.
Score	**8.00**	**20.00**	**24.00**	

Organizations: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)

Boone County Early Childhood Coalition

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Boone County Early Childhood Coalition			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides parenting skills training and consultation and organizes a coalition for early childhood providers. Screenings and coaching is more difficult to track long term outcomes and impact of services for families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	Triple P provides parenting skills to parents struggling. The coalition and screening is more difficult to tie to impacting the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been operating for several years. The program has had difficulty developing the hub and have utilization.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program provides screening services in community locations but do not target specific populations. The demographics do not show a large portion that are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased and CSF has been the only funder. The personnel administering screenings, community events, and coalition meetings seem to be overqualified which impacts the cost effectiveness of the program. The proposal lacks specific information on efforts to secure other funding sources.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization collaborates with organizations through the coalition to share resources. The program provides screenings at various locations but does not necessarily enhance services. Other organizations are listed as referral partners. The proposal provides a MOU with ECPBS and MACC.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal does not clearly describe the different facets of the program. The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	22.00	20.00	63.00	

Organizations: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)

ECPBS

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	ECPBS			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides training and coaching support to early childhood teachers.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps improve the professional skills of early childhood teachers to enhance programming for children.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization has experience offering the program.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program provides training to teachers from various child care centers. The program lacks diversity for the children being served through the program. A large majority of are over the 200% FPL. The program does not appear to serve centers that receive subsidies.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased significantly. The personnel is inconsistent. The program had significant excess revenues from FY2023. CSF has been the only funder. The proposal lacks specific information on efforts to secure other funding sources.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program works with child care centers to offer training and coaching. The proposal provided MOUs with BCECC and MACC.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Raw Score	23.00	20.00	68.00	

Organization: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Division of General Pediatrics, Department of Child Health, and University of Missouri Health Care)

HealthySteps
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**HealthySteps**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides support to families to new parents through attending doctor visits, providing case management, and doing home visits.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program helps new parents and reduce the risk for child abuse and neglect.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been offered for several years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves families that have meet certain criteria for eligibility. Children can only be enrolled prior to turning 4 months old.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased. MU provides a small amount of financial support but was not included in the budget. CSF is shown as the only funder.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program is involved in Brighter Beginnings but needs more specific information.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	28.00	20.00	83.00	

Organization: Moberly Area Community College

Quality Childcare Initiative

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Quality Childcare Initiative**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides training to Early Childhood Professionals.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps enhance services provided by childcare centers.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization has experience and expertise to provide the trainings. The program has struggled to have high school students enroll in the CDA training.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program provides training to Early Childhood Professionals but may not target centers with families at or below 200% FPL. The provides stipends to teachers completing the program.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program uses other scholarship funding to help cover costs for students completing the CDA. The funding request amount has increased compared to the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program collaborates with ECPBS and BCECC to enhance services for early childhood teachers. The program has tried to get high school students to enroll in the program by working with CPS, Hallsville, and Southern Boone County school districts.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**27.00**	**20.00**	**77.00**	

Evaluator Signatures - RFP #20-26JUN24

Signature	Name	Date
DocuSigned by: Michele Kennett 48A82151E111416...	Michele Kennett	12/2/2024
Signed by: Rodney Dixon	Rodney Dixon	12/2/2024
DocuSigned by: Robert Aulgur	Robert Aulgur	12/6/2024

Organization: Central Missouri Community Action

BRIDGE Program
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	BRIDGE Program			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides supports to children as they enter elementary school.
Does the proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps low-income families develop plans to address educational achievement and family stability.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has offered the program for several years and expanded into other counties.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program continues to serve more families whose first language is not English. Families are also at or below the 200% FPL. Majority of families have children in Head Start entering into Kindergarten. A teacher has to be willing to partner which can limit participation.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The program receives funding from HMUW but pays for Cooper and Howard counties. The funding request increased compared to the current contract. CSF has been the only funder for Boone County residents.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program works closely with the child's teacher and provides training on the impact poverty can have on a child.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked clarity on the budget.
Raw Score	26.00	20.00	75.00	

Organization: CHADS Coalition for Mental Health

CHADS School Outreach

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	CHADS School Outreach			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides information on suicide awareness and prevention but does not provide ongoing support to those served.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	There are existing resources in Boone County and the school districts.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The organization provides the program in other regions but not currenly established in Boone County.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The proposal does not identify specific populations or school buildings that would be served. No intential efforts to address equity was described. It's a universal prevention program.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The organization has funding for other regions but does not have funding for Boone County. The mileage cost is high.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The proposal does not describe discussions with school districts to determine if the program is needed or would be received into the school buildings. The proposal also states that school counselors would need to be present during the trainings which adds onto their existing workload.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked clarity on the budget.
Total Score	14.00	20.00	40.00	

Organization: City of Columbia on behalf of its Columbia/Boone County Department of Public Health and Human Services

School-Based Influenza Vaccination Clinic

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	hool-Based Influenza Vaccination Cli			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program is a one-time vaccination and would not provide long term services to generate an impact for families. Outcomes would be limited to demonstrate the impact of funding.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	1.00	4.00	4.00	The proposal describes the benefits of vaccination and reducing barriers by offering in the schools but there are other methods of families to receive vaccinations. The Scholars Clinic opened and provides opportunities for vaccines.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been provided in schools and has a system in place.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The program is a universal prevention program and is offered in all school buildings.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The program will no longer be funded by a foundation. Medicaid can be billed and vaccines are covered by another funding source. The request is low and could be covered by the City of Columbia.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program works with the school buildings to schedule vaccination clinics and collect permission forms from families.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	20.00	20.00	51.00	

Organization: Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture

Farm to School
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Farm to School**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides experiences to supplement chlidrens' learning.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program goals hope to increase healthy eating habits but does not address immediate needs of children.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been offered for several years. The program is adjusting how it is offered due to the Boone County Nature School and change in supplemental educational activities within CPS.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program has historically offered supplemental educational activities to targeted elementary schools with higher levels for Free/Reduced Lunch. However, the proposal seeks to expand to all 3rd grade classrooms within CPS.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The funding request is significantly higher than the current contract. CSF has increased funding for the program. Other funding sources are listed in the budget. The kickstart programming at the Nature School could be removed from the funding request.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program collaborates with CPS and other organizations.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**26.00**	**20.00**	**70.00**	

Organization: Compass Health, Inc.

School-Based Therapy
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	School-Based Therapy			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides therapeutic services in schools to reduce barriers to access.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to mental health services is a need in the community. The program provides supports in the school building, including rural communities.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has struggled to utilize the current contract but is fully staffed. The organization is well established. Other schools could be contacted to provide support and increase utilization.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program targets rural school districts. The program is dependent on school counselors to refer to the program. The program serves underinsured or uninsured students.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased compared to the current contract. The current contract has been underutilized. CSF is listed in the only funder in the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program works closely with school counselors and other referring agencies.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked clarity on the budget.
Raw Score	24.00	20.00	74.00	

Organization: Jefferson City Area YMCA

Tri-Health Initiative

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Tri-Health Initiative**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program provides enhanced educational activities to Middle School students in Southern Boone.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The organization is located in a rural community. The program is prevention-based and targets specific age group. The summer camp is only offered for an hour and does not meet a need for families needing care during the summer.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	Programming offered in the schools was previously funded. The organization currently provides the summer camps.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program is offered to Middle School students. The proposal did not identify any specific equity issues and efforts to address disparities.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	0.00	2.00	0.00	The Development/Start Up funding is to purchase supplies for the school district. The program would eliminate service fees or would not implement a sliding fee scale for the summer camp. The total funding request to CSF was not included in the budget and no other funding source was included.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The proposal describes working Southern Boone School District and other health professionals to provide the program.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal follows some of the instructions but could use further clarification and negotiation.
Raw Score	16.00	20.00	46.00	

Organization: Powerhouse Community Development Corporation

Healthy Choices

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Healthy Choices**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides programming in the schools, afterschool, and during the summer to improve outcomes of youth.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides programming to at-risk youth and their parents.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has provided the program for a couple years. The current contract has been fully utilized.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program targets at-risk youth and their families. The school-based programming is offered at Douglass High School, West Middle School, Alpha Hart Elementary School, Oakland Middle School, and QUEST.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The program has several funding sources but the request to CSF is 74% of the budget. The funding request is significantly higher than the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program works with several schools to offer school-based programming but did not provide MOUs. The proposal mentions working with other organizations but is unclear on how it relates directly to the proposed program.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	25.00	20.00	73.00	

Organizations: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)

MU Bridge Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	MU Bridge Program			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides access to psychiatry services to children through school-based services.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to mental health is a critical need to children and youth. The program is offered in the school which helps reduce access barriers.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has provided services for several years and has built relationships and a referral system.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	Participants are referred through organizations and school counselors. The program serves a higher percentage of students at or below the 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	CSF is the only funding source listed in the budget and has been historically. The funding request has increased significantly. Further discussion is needed on the funding structure moving forward.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program provides services in the schools and has a referral system with other organizations. The proposal provided MOUs. There are several partners listed in the proposal that no longer exist.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	27.00	20.00	80.00	

Organization: The Food Bank for Central and Northeast Missouri, Inc.

Children's Supplemental Food Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Children's Supplemental Food Program			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides supplemental food to children in the schools. There are no long term outcomes that can be tracked.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Food insecurity is a critical need in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been offered in schools for several years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program relies on children utilizing the pantry or teachers identifying food insecurity and providing Buddy Packs. The demographics are difficult to accurately capture due to how the service is delivered.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program is offered in several counties and has multiple funding sources. The funding request to CSF was decreased compared to the current contracted amounts.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program is offered in school buildings.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	27.00	20.00	77.00	

Evaluator Signatures - RFP #20-26JUN24

Signature	Name	Date
DocuSigned by: Leigh Spence 450A59A8325D4B3...	Leigh Spence	12/2/2024
Signed by: Rodney Dixon	Rodney Dixon	12/2/2024
Signed by: Greg Grupe	Greg Grupe	12/2/2024

Organization: HeartSpace Clinic

Safe and Sound Protocol

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Safe and Sound Protocol**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The proposal provides anecdotal evidence that the treatment helps clients.
Does the proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program helps address trauma but does not combine with traditional therapeutic services. The funding request includes a substantial amount for educating professionals and community members on trauma compared to providing direct services.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been delivering the modality for several years and provides data supporting efficacy.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal does not clearly describe populations that will be served and how it relates to equity. The demographics does not serve a higher percentage of those at or below 200% FPL. The proposal lists adults 20 and over which needs clarification.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The funding request increased significantly. The proposal includes funding to train community members and professionals on trauma rather than providing direct services to families. The proposal also requests funding for training and anticipates continuous turnover. The program can not be billed to insurance.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal describes referral network and educational support to teachers and professionals.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked clarity on the budget.
Raw Score	20.00	20.00	56.00	

Organization: Heriford House Foundation

No Family Left Behind

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**No Family Left Behind**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides therapeutic services and intensive case management to a marginalized population.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program address access to therapeutic services by targeting a high-risk population.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization was recently established but offered a component of the program through a sub-contract. The proposal lacked clarity on the different modalities that would be used and for which clientele.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program targets at-risk youth that may be involved in the juvenile justice system.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	Insurance and Medicaid will be billed but is a low amount. Further negotiation is needed on the invoicing and billing structure. The salary ranges are extremely high in the personnel. The funding request is extremely high and is inconsistent throughout the proposal. The outputs need further revision.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program works with the Juvenile Justice System for a portion of their youth. The proposal lists sources that no longer exist.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Total Score	**24.00**	**20.00**	**73.00**	

Organization: KVC Behavioral Healthcare Missouri, Inc.

HOPE Program
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**HOPE Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides therapeutic services and case management to families at-risk for child abuse and neglect.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to therapeutic services is a need in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program was previously operated by Great Circle but transitioned to KVC following the merger. The program has struggled with referrals and recognition in the community following the merger and program name change.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The proposal describes equity issues the program addresses and need. The program targets families that are at-risk of child abuse and neglect. Majority of families are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The program is able to bill Medicaid and insurance. The funding request increased compared to the current contract. The unit rates need to be reviewed and adjusted. The therapist positions appeared to be contracted out rather than KVC employees.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	KVC merged with Great Circle and may need to build relationships within Boone County. The proposal lists numerous organizations but does not clearly describe how it enhances services for clients.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not fully use the Taxonomy of Services and include program costs correctly into the unit rates.
Raw Score	**23.00**	**20.00**	**73.00**	

Organization: Lutheran Family and Children's Services of Missouri

Counseling and Parenting Services

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Counseling and Parenting Services**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides therapeutic services and home visiting.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to therapeutic services and home visiting to families is a need in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been provided for several years and is well established.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program helps reduce barriers to therapy and home visiting programs. The demographics show a diverse population being served. Majority of the individuals served are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program increased the funding request to CSF. Additional funding sources are listed in the budget. The program is able to bill insurance and Medicaid.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program mentions collaborating with Brighter Beginnings but needs more detailed information. Other referral sources and collaboration was mentioned.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**32.00**	**20.00**	**92.00**	

Organization: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of Debora Bell, Ph.D. and the Psychological Services Clinic)

MU PSC

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	MU PSC			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides therapeutic services to children, youth, and families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to therapy is a need in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has been running the clinic and offering services for a long time. Trainings have also been delivered for several years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The funding request helps pay for services for underinsured and uninsured individuals. The individuals served lacks diversity. The trainings are provided to professionals in the community.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request increased significantly. The unit rates seem high for trainings and group rates. The organization bills insurance and Medicaid.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The proposal describes partners and referral sources.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	29.00	20.00	84.00	

Organization: The Curators of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Psychiatry)

Child Trauma Initiative of BC

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Child Trauma Initiative of BC**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides therapeutic services for families that have experienced trauma.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Access to therapy is a need in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been offered for several years and expanded to other communities.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves families that have experienced trauma. The demographics show racial diversity and majority at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program can bill insurance and Medicaid. The funding request increased significantly and is 68% of the budget. The program requests a funding increase to expand the age range that can be served in the program. The department received funding to provide the program across the state but not appear to allocate the award to Boone County. The program had excess revenues at the end of FY2023.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal describes referral sources.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**29.00**	**20.00**	**84.00**	

Organization: United Cerebral Palsy Heartland

United Cerebral Palsy Heartland

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**United Cerebral Palsy Heartland**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provideds services to support individuals diagnosed with autism using Applied Behavior Analysis.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program is described as increasing accessiblity to potentially underserved populations in receiving a diagnosis. Description of the program needs further clarification to understand if individuals are served prior to diagnosis.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	It is unclear what level of experience the organization has with the proposed program from the proposal. The organization is based in St. Louis.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program proposes to serve 14 individuals in Boone County.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The budget showed funding from Medicaid, HMUW, and Fundraising. The proposed budget needs clarification to understand percent of revenue from various sources since CSF was not included in the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The proposal mentions practioner involvement in a networking group and includes no mention of Boone County organizations.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services. No description was provided for the Development/Start Up Funding requested and the amount requested to CSF was not included in the budget.
Score	**18.00**	**20.00**	**53.00**	

Evaluator Signatures - RFP #20-26JUN24

Signature	Name	Date
Signed by: Sebastian Martinez Valdivia	Sebastian Martinez Valdivia	12/9/2024
DocuSigned by: Robert Aulgur	Robert Aulgur	12/2/2024

Organization: Cora Community Outreach

Cor Columbia

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Cor Columbia			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides afterschool programming and offers academic support and mentoring to youth. The program has a history of building meaningful relationships and wrap around support for youth.
Does the proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program helps youth improve academic achievement and post-secondary plans.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program is well established in the community.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves a diverse population but only serves male athletes. Majority of the individuals are at or below 200% FPL. The program is located on the south side of town and can have transportation barriers.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request is the same as the current contract. CSF is 67% of the budget with the remaining amount coming from fund raising or other direct support.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The proposal lists various partners that help enhance the program and outcomes of participants.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	31.00	20.00	90.00	

Organization: Coyote Hill

Family Stability Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Family Stability Program			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides supervised visits for parents and their children that have been removed from the home. The proposal also provides respite events for foster children and support groups for foster parents.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	There is a high number of children in foster care as well as difficulty in finding foster homes. The program provides support to foster families in order to maintain stability and retention rate.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization is well established in the community and has a history of supporting foster children and foster families.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program serves foster children and foster parents. The program appears to lack diversity in the children being served. About half of the individuals are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The funding request amount is higher than the current contract and is 35% of the proposed budget. The budget lists various funding sources.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The proposal lists resources and referral sources used to help children and foster children. There are several sources listed that may have a faith-based component and needs further clarification.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The Common Outcomes were utilized but the Performance Measures need to be revised. The proposal utilized the Taxonomy of Services. The services need further clarification. The proposal did not provide all the required attachments.
Total Score	25.00	20.00	72.00	

Organization: Destiny of H.O.P.E.

Youth Empowerment
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Youth Empowerment**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The proposal was difficult to understand. There are multiple programs or services described. Components of the program would be beneficial to marginalized youth.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The organization serves a difficult population to reach and has staff with lived experiences. The program strives to reduce gang involvement and guide youth to more positive outcomes.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has seen significant growth but needs capacity building to build stability. The organization is funded through the Grassroots Funding Opportunity for the PEACE and HOPE Center.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program serves a diverse population that can be difficult to reach. Majority of individuals to be served are at or below 200% FPL. It's unclear who will be served through the violence prevention services.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The budget lists other funding sources, including the Grassroots Funding Opportunity funding. Combined, the total amount from CSF is 80% of the budget. Clarification is needed on how adults 20 and over would be funded for the various programs/services described in the proposal. Clarification is needed on how services are funded through ARPA and CPS and for how long.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal lists initiatives that are tied to their organization. There are other organizations listed but lack specifics of how it enhances services for individuals.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal did not follow all instructions in the RFP.
Raw Score	**18.00**	**20.00**	**53.00**	

Organization: Dream Tree Academy 573

Dream Tree Academy

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Dream Tree Academy			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides art-based programming to children and youth.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	1.00	4.00	4.00	The program is a need in the community but is currently funded through the Grassroots Funding Opportunity.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The organization was recently funded through Grassroots Funding Opportunity to become more established an build capacity.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program serves a diverse population but lacks transportation to reduce access barriers. Majority of the individuals are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	CSF the only primary funding source in the budget and is already funding the program through the Grassroots Funding Opportunity. There are some individuals listed in the demographics that can not be served through CSF.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program mentioned working with SEED Success. The proposal lacked specific information on organizations/businesses they work with and how it enhances services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not follow the instructions in the RFP.
Raw Score	13.00	20.00	40.00	

Organization: Grade A Plus Incorporated

Out of School Program Staffing

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Out of School Program Staffing			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides tutoring and activities for children. Clarification is needed on the scope of the program and the services being requested to CSF. The number of individuals to be served seems low.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides tutoring through Out of School Programming with the goal of impacting educational outcomes.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has been operating for several years. The proposal is unclear on what activities are currently offered or are new.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program serves a diverse population and a majority are at or below 200% FPL. Clarification is needed on accessing the program. The hours may be a problem for youth accessing the program. There is a gap when school ends and when the program starts.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The budget has multiple funding streams. Clarification is needed on the expenses that would be covered by CSF. The organization was funded through the Grassroots Funding Opportunity but is for case management. The funding request to CSF was not provided in the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The organization lists various organizations but lack information on how they enhance services. The organization participates in the CPS Extended Partners group to collaborate other afterschool programs.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal did not follow all the instructions in the RFP.
Raw Score	22.00	20.00	66.00	

Organization: Heart of Missouri CASA

CASA Child Advocacy
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**CASA Child Advocacy**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides advocacy support for children and youth removed from their home by working with the court system.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program strives to achieve permanency faster compared to children and youth without a CASA volunteer. The proposal states volunteers tend to receive more complicated cases.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program is well-established and has consistently grown every year in the number of individuals served and volunteers.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves a diverse population. Children in the foster care system which tends to have a high rate of disparities.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The funding request increased significantly compared to the current contract. The budget lists multiple funding streams. The proposed unit rate has increased. The proposal mentions adding a position for solely training volunteers.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program describes working closely with the court system and is involved in various groups to improve systems.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**33.00**	**20.00**	**95.00**	

Organization: Kingdom Konnections

Kingdom Konnections
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

1. Overall	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
	Kingdom Konnections			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides parenting skills training and support. Clarification is needed on the curriculum that is used in the program.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program is filling a gap in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization is fairly new but has existing relationships with primary referral sources. The organization staff has lived experiences and cultural competency skills that would benefit the population being served.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program is serving a diverse population and has majority of individuals are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utillze additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	Some of the items listed in Development/Start Up funding may not be necessary. The funding request seemed reasonable and has other funding streams. The program serves non-Boone County residents so units of service would need to be tracked closely.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization is well connected in the community despite being a newer nonprofit.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization completed most of the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	28.00	20.00	84.00	

Organization: Rainbow House

Rainbow House
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Rainbow House**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program provides case management and positive activities for children/youth staying in the shelter. Clarification is needed on the frequency and quality of activities for Positive Youth Development. The organization has turnover which causes low utilization of the enrichment services.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	Emergency shelter is a need in the community. The organization is the only one in the community that meets the need. The program has underutilized funding from CSF. There is a low number of children that invoiced to CSF.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The program has been operating for a long time but has ongoing, serious issues. Utilization and staff turnover has been an issue.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program serves families and children that need services. The program serves a diverse population and majority are at or below 200% FPL. The staff pay does not advance equity or upward mobility.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The funding request increased significantly. The unit rates are the same but program has been operating at a deficit. The request is for more units of service but has historically been underutilized. The pay for shelter staff is extremely low. The organization has stated in the past new employees have to pay for training and other onboarding costs. The budget has multiple funding streams. The organization lost funding from Heart of Missouri United Way.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The proposal listed various referral partners.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	**18.00**	**20.00**	**49.00**	

Organization: School of Service d/b/a Access Arts

Youth Arts Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Youth Arts Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides art programming to children through various partnerships.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides access to quality art programming. The funding request would help address financial barriers for families.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been operating and has experience providing art instruction.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization describes a history of providing art instruction to people with disabilities. The class times and transportation may be a barrier for families.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal describes program service fees and other funding sources. The cost of the program and fees is high and needs clarification.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program works closely with a school to allow students to walk to the organization's location. The program also collaborates with organizations to deliver services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Score	28.00	20.00	80.00	

Organization: The Curations of the University of Missouri (on behalf of the Department of Occupational Therapy)

SWIM
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**SWIM**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides swimming instructions to children with Autism and their families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps reduce the risk of drowning for children with disabilities.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been operating for several years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves children with disabilities.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased compared to the current contract. CSF is the only funder. The proposal does not describe efforts to secure other funding sources. The proposal requests additional funding to extend instruction time and serve more children. The service structure needs to be reviewed further.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal lists various referral sources and support provided by MU.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	24.00	20.00	70.00	

Organization: True North of Columbia, Inc.

True North's Children's Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**True North's Children's Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides positive parenting skills and support to children that are victims of domestic violence.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The organization provides critical services and offers support to children experiencing trauma.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been provided for several years and continued after CSF funding ended in 2022.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program serves women and children that are victims of domestic violence. Majority are at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utillze additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program was previously funded and continued operating the program. The budget is inconsistent with various revenue streams.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization is involved in numerous community partnerships to enhance services and provide referrals.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services. The budget was not completed correctly.
Raw Score	**32.00**	**20.00**	**93.00**	

Organization: Woodhaven Learning Center

Afterschool Youth Program
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Afterschool Youth Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The proposal will provide afterschool programming to children with disabilities. The program is new to the organization and may have difficult starting up.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	Afterschool programming is a need in the community but is new to the organization. The proposal serves a low number of individuals.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The program is new to the organinization and may have difficulty starting up.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program will serve children with disabilities but serves a low number. Clarification is needed on transportation to access the program.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The budget did not include the funding request to CSF. The budget lists Medicaid waivers but needs to be redone. The revenues greatly exceed the expenses.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal lists several referral sources, including rural school districts. It's unclear on how students would access the program. Other organizations are listed but does not provide information on how it enhances services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal utilized the Common Outcomes. The budget was not completed correctly. Clarification is needed on the funding request amount.
Raw Score	**13.00**	**20.00**	**40.00**	

Evaluator Signatures - RFP #20-26JUN24

Signature	Name	Date
Signed by: Greg Grupe 74AAE010D25E47B...	Greg Grupe	12/2/2024
DocuSigned by: Lynn E Barnett [illegible]	Lynn Barnett	12/2/2024

Organization: Bethany Christian Services of Missouri

Safe Families for Children

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Safe Families for Children**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides respite care for families experiencing a crisis to help prevent children being removed from the home.
Does the proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps reduce the risk for child abuse and neglect to avoid more children entering the foster care system.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has been offered in Boone County for several years but has continued to be underutilized. It appears majority of individuals that are served reside outside Boone County.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves a diverse population and individuals are at or below 200% FPL. There is concern that families may not be aware of the services.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The funding request amount slightly increased but has a history of underutilizing the current contract. The unit rates increased for several proposed services. Majority of the individuals to be served are Non-Boone County residents which equals 68%.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program lists various referral sources and describes being involved with different community groups. The program listed organizations/businesses that are targeted to recruit host families and volunteers.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**29.00**	**20.00**	**82.00**	

Organization: Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Missouri

One-on-One Mentoring with BBBS

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**One-on-One Mentoring with BBBS**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides mentoring services to youth.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Mentoring services is a need in the community. The goal of the program is see children develop positive identities and have a positive role model in their lives.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program is well established. The program struggled following COVID-19 but has seen significant improvement over the last couple years.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program services a diverse population with the majority being at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The funding request increased slightly. The program struggled with utilization following COVID but have seen improvement. The program has diverse funding streams. The unit rates increased compared to the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program collaborates with various organizations by linking participants with mentors.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal followed most of the instructions outlined in the RFP.
Total Score	**32.00**	**20.00**	**94.00**	

Organization: Boy Scouts of America Great Rivers Council

Great Rivers Council Scoutreach

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

1. Overall	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
	Great Rivers Council Scoutreach			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides scouting activities afterschool.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program helps generate positive idenities and skills for children. The program does not provide afterschool programming everyday that alleviates afterschool care for families.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization is well established nationally and locally. The program relies on a high number of volunteers which would be difficult to secure given the program hours.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program lists 10 schools with several having high rates of Free and Reduce Lunch or are rural schools. The program charges a $36 fee per participant. It's unclear on how the troops/dens funded through the program are considered separate from regular troops not funded through the proposal. Clarification is needed on how the different groups are integrated.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The organization covers a large area and has substantial assets. The funding request is 88% of the proposed budget. Clarification is needed on why CSF funding is needed.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal describes the program will be held in seven CPS schools and three rural schools. No other partnerships or collaboration efforts were described. The proposal is unclear on if schools are willing to host the afterschool programming.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed the instructions listed in the RFP.
Raw Score	20.00	20.00	55.00	

Organization: Boys & Girls Clubs of the Columbia Area

Great Futures Start Here

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Great Futures Start Here**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides out of school programming to children and youth.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program meets a need by providing afterschool care. The program helps build academic success and positive identities.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has been in the community for a long time. The organization has struggled with leadership in the past but has improved significantly over the last year.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves a diverse population with a majority at or below 200% FPL. The program only operates at the main clubhouse site. It used to have afterschool programming at several CPS buildings but now transports children to the main site. This can cause transportation barriers for families to pick up their children.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request increased significantly compared to the current contract. The CSF amount is 16% of the budget. The program has multiple funding streams. The unit rates increased and number of units compared to the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The proposal lists a couple partnerships that enhance services for children.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**31.00**	**20.00**	**90.00**	

Organization: Catholic Charities of Central and Northern Missouri

Mentoring All Refugee Kids

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Mentoring All Refugee Kids			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides mentoring and academic support to refugee/immigrant children.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program serves a diverse population and supports academic success.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program is relatively new but has expanded to more age ranges.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program services refugee/immigrant youth. All participants are at or below 200% FPL. The ethnicity section was not completed.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request increased compared to the current contract. CSF is the only funder for the program.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program describes numerous organizations that are used for referrals and locations for youth to visit for field trips.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	27.00	20.00	80.00	

Organization: Central Missouri Foster Care & Adoption Association (CMFCAA)

Family Crisis Stabilization Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Family Crisis Stabilization Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides case management and training to license foster parents.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	There is a need in the community to increase the number of foster families. There is state funding that can be used to still meet the need in the community.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has been providing trainings for several years. The organization has been required for several years to provide invoice documentation.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The proposal does not show diversity of potential foster families becoming licensed or participating in the program.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request to CSF is 5% of the budget. The remaining amount is from the State but is used for other counties. Clarification is needed on why CSF is needed when state funding is used for all other locations.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal lists multiple agencies but does not describe how they enhance the program for participants.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not follow directions in the RFP.
Raw Score	**18.00**	**20.00**	**53.00**	

Organization: Central Missouri Foster Care & Adoption Association (CMFCAA)

Respite Care Odyssey Events

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Respite Care Odyssey Events**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides respite events for children in foster care or are adopted.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides positive events for children in foster care and help reduce stress of foster families.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has been offered in the community for several years. Utilization has been low.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves children in foster care or are adopted. The demographics show some diversity of children being served.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	0.00	2.00	0.00	The funding request based on the program services is the same amount as the current contract. The current contract has not been fully utilized. The budget lists state funding and no amount requested to CSF in the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program has been hosted at the ARC and promotes the program to various organizations serving the targeted population.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not follow directions in the RFP.
Score	19.00	20.00	61.00	

Organization: CHA Low-Income Services, Inc.

Healthy Home Connections

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Healthy Home Connections**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides case management support of families receiving housing support.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps families connect to resources to maintain stability.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization has a history of providing housing support along with case management. The program experiences frequent turnover in staff.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves families that have low income and receiving housing support.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The program does not have any other funding source and lacks specific information of securing additional funding.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The organization provides referral sources to other resources in the community.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal did not follow all the instructions in the RFP.
Score	**21.00**	**20.00**	**62.00**	

Organization: CHA Low-Income Services, Inc.

Moving Ahead Afterschool & Summer

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Moving Ahead Afterschool & Summer**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides afterschool programming to children receiving housing support from CHA.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Afterschool programming is a need in the community. The program offers a safe place for kids to go after school and provides educational support.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program is well established.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program targets low income families that receiving housing assistance. The program is located near CHA properties but lacks clarity on how children get to the program afterschool.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has multiple funding streams. The funding request is significantly higher than the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program lists mutliple entities that enhance program services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal did not follow all the instructions in the RFP.
Score	**30.00**	**20.00**	**89.00**	

Organization: City of Columbia

CPS Extended Partners Afterschool Programs

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	CPS Extended Partners Afterschool Programs			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	0.00	4.00	0.00	
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	0.00	4.00	0.00	
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	0.00	2.00	0.00	
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	0.00	3.00	0.00	
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	0.00	2.00	0.00	
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	0.00	3.00	0.00	
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	0.00	2.00	0.00	
Raw Score	0.00	20.00	0.00	

The proposal is non-responsive for not meeting the mandatory requirements stated in the RFP.

Organization: Columbia Supreme

Columbia Supreme Youth Mentoring

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGH	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	Columbia Supreme Youth Mentoring			BASIS FOR SCORE
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The proposal lists numerous services and activities for youth participating in their athletic programming.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The proposal is attempting to expand programming. The goal is to provide wrap around supports through mentoring, tutoring, a youth center, and other activities to meet a need in the community. The overall request may be outside their capacity.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The organization is fairly new and is currently funded through the Grassroots Funding Opportunity. The overall request seems to demonstrate a lack of capacity to expand to the proposed level of programming.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program serves a diverse population and seeks to address multiple areas in the childrens' lives to address equity issues. More information is needed on how the program can be accessed and ability to reduce barriers.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request is extremely high. The amount in the budget does not match the funding request total for the program services. The organization is currently funded through the Grassroots Funding Opportunity for case managers.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The proposal lists several organizations but does not provide details on how it enhances the program.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not follow the instructions.
Raw Score	12.00	20.00	39.00	

Organization: Community Playground of Columbia, Inc.

Fun City Youth Academy

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGH	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Fun City Youth Academy**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides afterschool and summer enrichment programming.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Afterschool programming is a need in the community. The program offers a safe place for kids to go after school and provides educational support.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The summer programming is well established. The program recently expended to ongoing afterschool programming throughout the school year.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program has a history of serving families with low income and children that are academically behind.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The program has multiple funding streams. The funding request is significantly higher than the current contract.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The summer program operates in a CPS elementary school and has a MOU. The organization collaborates with multiple entities to recruit volunteers.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**33.00**	**20.00**	**96.00**	

Organization: Connections to Success, Inc.

Families Pathways to Success

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Families Pathways to Success**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The provides education to parents but access to the program is extremely limiting. The initial training is for 60 hours for two weeks (Monday-Friday, 9:00-4:00pm).
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	Parent programs are needed but the program hours are extremely limiting.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The organization is well established in other areas but more recently expanded to Boone County.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The proposal would serve a diverse population but access the program is a significant barrier.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request to CSF is 94% of the budget with the remaining amount coming from organizational donations.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The organization is new in the community and mentions the struggle of gaining trust. The proposal lists a few organizations as referral sources and places were meetings could be held.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Raw Score	**14.00**	**20.00**	**42.00**	

Evaluator Signatures - RFP #20-26JUN24

Signature	Name	Date
DocuSigned by: Leigh Spence 450A59A8325D4B3...	Leigh Spence	12/2/2024
Signed by: Sebastian Martinez Valdivia	Sebastian Martinez Valdivia	12/2/2024
DocuSigned by: [redacted]	Connie Leipard	12/3/2024

Organization: Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture

Opportunity Gardens

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Opportunity Gardens**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	Participants are taught gardening skills but food to meet basic needs is delayed or may not happen. Participants are at 200% FPL and may not have the ability to be dedicated to maintaining a garden to offset hunger and income constraints.
Does the proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	Meeting basic needs a critical need in the community but the program relies on participants growing and harvesting their own food.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has provided the program for numerous years and has a strong system in place.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program accommodates serving individuals that do not own their own property. The program also collaborates with multiple organizations that have an equitable focus. Eligibility for the program is for individuals at or below 200% FPL.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has several funding sources but increased the funding request to CSF for expansion. If funded, the funding request should be up to the current contract amount.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program works closely with local organizations for referrals and landlords to receive approval of installing gardens.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**26.00**	**20.00**	**70.00**	

Organization: Columbia Farmers Market

Food Incentive Programming at CFM

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Food Incentive Programming at CFM**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	Food security is important for all families and allows access to fresh produce. Families may be hestiant to participant due to perception of a higher cost for food at the Farmers Market.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program helps address food insecurity and health disparities observed in low-income families.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has a system in place to track tokens and recruiting new participants. The organization is alleviating an additional administrative burden by taking over the Produce Prescription program from CCUA.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves low-income families and demographic section reflects diverse populations being served.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The program has several funding sources but increased the funding request to CSF for expansion. If funded, the funding request should be up to the current contract amount. Consider paying a percentage of the Development/Start Up comparable to the number to be funded through CSF.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization collaborates with vendors to accept tokens, Compass Health, and CCUA.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Total Score	**27.00**	**20.00**	**78.00**	

Organization: Fostering Life-Changing Opportunities

Flourish Forward

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Flourish Forward**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program offers life experiences to youth but primarliy serves individuals that are not eligible for CSF funding.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The funding request does not meet a critical need.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization is already providing the activities but lacked details on the curriculum that will be used for the groups.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program serves a vulnerable population but the proposed services do not address equity issues or advancement.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	0.00	2.00	0.00	The proposal describes some existing funding but the requested funding would increase spending for activities. Funding would also supplant existing funding.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The program receives food donations from The Food Bank and brings professionals/businesses in to present to the youth.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked clarity on the budget.
Raw Score	14.00	20.00	39.00	

Organization: Fostering Life-Changing Opportunities

Flourish Prep Internship Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Flourish Prep Internship Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The proposal provides paid internships to at-risk youth and provides case management support to ensure stability.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	Job development opportunities are a need in the community. The program targets a disadvantaged population that may need more assistance in job training. The internship program is only offered during the summer.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The program has been in operation for several years and has expanded to other businesses for internships.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program focuses on youth that come from disadvantaged backgrounds.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request amount increased compared to the current contract. The program has secured or applied to multiple funding streams.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program offers internship opportunities in office settings compared to retail employment. The program works with Missouri Job Center, CPS, and other employers.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	29.00	20.00	82.00	

Organization: Fresh Start Sober Living Programs

Fresh Start Family Reunification Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Fresh Start Family Reunification Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The population is currently not directly funded by CSF. The organization has direct contact with the population which allows for reunification services to be better received.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	Reunification is a need for the proposed population. The funding request needs to be reduced to target more specific critical services.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has become more established but reunification support appears to be a new service offered to clients.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The proposal serves a marginalized population that experience housing insecurity.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The funding request is extremely high and is 48% of the proposed budget. The program lacks diversity in funding streams. More information is needed on the scope of the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal lacks details on the organizations that the program collaborates with to enhance services. The proposal describes referral sources rather than collaboration with organizations.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions.
Raw Score	**23.00**	**20.00**	**68.00**	

Organization: Job Point

AmeriCorp
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**AmeriCorp**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program helps participants obtain their high school equivalency degree. The program serves adults not eligible for CSF support. The program does not provide direct instruction to participants.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	There are multiple businesses/organizations that offer similar programming.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The organization has experience offering the program. The organization as a whole offers multiple programs that overlap services and participants which causes confusion.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program does not provide childcare for parents. The proposal describes barriers to testing centers to complete the HiSET.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal describes match funding but CSF has historically provided majority/all of the match. The funding request has increased significantly. The match amount is not consistent throughout the proposal.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The proposal describes referral sources rather than collaboration to enhance services.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked consistency.
Raw Score	22.00	20.00	63.00	

Organization: Job Point

Boone County Builds Youth
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Boone County Builds Youth**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The proposal describes serving youth but also included adults 20 and over that are not eligible for CSF. The proposal included therapeutic services which seems like a mission drift.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The proposal provides vocational training while allowing youth to be dually enrolled. Therapeutic services are outside the expertise and mission of the organization.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has provided instruction on the various Vocational Skills Training courses. The organization has struggled to gain full support from school districts. The organization does not traditionally provide therapeutic services.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The proposal is inconsistent in the population that will be served, however, describes working with youth that are not on track to graduate and could be more successful in an alternative learning environment.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request increased significantly. Other funding streams are listed in the budget.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The organization has support from several school districts but need to be further developed.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The scope of the program is difficult to follow with conflicting populations, adding services outside expertise of the organization, and not following all instructions.
Score	20.00	20.00	58.00	

Organization: Love Columbia Corp

Path Forward
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Path Forward**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program is serving families that are housing insecure and helps address additional basic needs.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	Housing insecurity and affordability is a growing concern in the community. The program assists families to overcome this barrier.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has been offering the program for several years and has grown significantly.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The program receives referrals from numerous agencies and serves a diverse population.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The funding request is significantly higher than the current contract amount. The proposal requested funding for hotel/motel vouchers. The program has diverse funding streams.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	5.00	3.00	15.00	The organization is highly involved in the community and willing to assist various causes.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal followed majority of the instructions but lacked clarity on the budget.
Score	32.00	20.00	94.00	

Organization: L.O.V.E. Our Youth, Inc.

Rise & Thrive
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Rise & Thrive**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The proposal does not provide specific information on the programming and services that will be provided.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The proposal did not clearly describe how the need would be addressed.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The organization is located in Florida and does not have an existing presence in Boone County.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	1.00	3.00	3.00	The proposal did not describe populations that would be targeted for services.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	0.00	2.00	0.00	The proposal did not list any other funding sources.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	0.00	3.00	0.00	The organization does not describe any existing relationships in Boone County.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal did not provide clear information or follow all the instructions.
Score	**8.00**	**20.00**	**25.00**	

Organization: Seed Success

QHOPE
CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**QHOPE**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	2.00	4.00	8.00	The program does not provide direct services to families and relies on another organization to deliver programming to youth.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	3.00	4.00	12.00	The program provides direct financial deposits to youth but has a delayed impact for eventually utilizing the funds.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal is unclear on how the program will be implemented.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The program proposes to collaborate with an organization serving at-risk youth. However, organizations have issues gaining permission from parents/guardians to establish and maintain the accounts. The program serves a low number of individuals for the funding request amount.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The funding request is for incentive deposits that the Board has historically not wanted to directly fund. The funding request may be a pass through for an organization that could be directly funded by CSF.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	2.00	3.00	6.00	The proposal is collaborating with another organization but lacks clarity on roles and details.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	1.00	2.00	2.00	The proposal did not follow the instructions.
Raw Score	13.00	20.00	40.00	

Organization: The Food Bank for Central and Northeast Missouri, Inc.

Food Bank Market Children & Families

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**Food Bank Market Children & Families**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides food that can be easily accessed.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program is located in an easily accessible location and reduces barriers to receive services. Food costs are high and helps address a critical needs.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has experience offering the program and has significantly enhanced programming with the new location.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves families in need but the hours are slightly limiting.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The organization has diverse funding streams but significantly increased the funding request to CSF. Majority of the expenses were in personnel compared to purchasing food.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization collaborates with multiple organizations and has a dedicated space at the Market for Compass Health.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization completed the proposal correctly by utilizing the Common Outcomes and Taxonomy of Services.
Raw Score	**31.00**	**20.00**	**90.00**	

Organization: Voluntary Action Center

VAC Basic Needs Program

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**VAC Basic Needs Program**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The proposal provides basic needs items but does not directly address root causes.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	5.00	4.00	20.00	The program provides access to critical basic needs items.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	5.00	2.00	10.00	The organization has offered the program for a long time in the community and described expanding lobby hours.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves families in need but the hours are still slightly limiting.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The funding request amount slightly increased. The program has diverse funding streams and items donated by various entities. The program serves a high number of individuals for the funding amount requested.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The organization collaborates with multiple organizations and provided MOUs.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	4.00	2.00	8.00	The proposal listed every basic need item as individual services and need to be adjusted to align with the current service structure.
Raw Score	30.00	20.00	86.00	

Organization: Woodhaven Learning Center

EnCircle Technologies

CRITERIA CHECKLIST

	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE	Scores Available from 0-5 (whole numbers only). Basis for scoring may be included below.
1. Overall	**EnCircle Technologies**			**BASIS FOR SCORE**
Does the proposed program provide meaningful services to children, youth, and families?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program provides support to youth with disabilities and their families.
Does this proposal address needs in the community?	4.00	4.00	16.00	The program describes high un-/underemployment rates for individuals with disabilities and provides training and coaching to increase employment.
Does the organization have experience or a developed plan to provide the proposed program?	3.00	2.00	6.00	The program has delivered majority of the services for several years but added afterschool programming.
Does this proposal improve equitable access to services?	4.00	3.00	12.00	The program serves individuals with disabilities and their families.
Does the proposal utilize additional funds to support program expenses?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The salary ranges are extremely high for the top compensated employees. The funding request increased significantly. The budget did not include service fees or other applicable funding streams.
Does the proposal include substantive collaboration?	3.00	3.00	9.00	The program builds relationships with various employers. The program also receives referrals and reimbursement from Boone County Family Resources.
Does the proposal follow directions outlined in the RFP?	2.00	2.00	4.00	The proposal did not follow all instructions and is inconsistent.
Raw Score	22.00	20.00	67.00	

Evaluator Signatures - RFP #20-26JUN24

Signature	Name	Date
DocuSigned by: Lynn E Barnett E714C74E174D4C1	Lynn Barnett	12/2/2024
DocuSigned by: Connie Leipard DBAA928FB40449D	Connie Leipard	12/3/2024
W. Wiley Miller	W. Wiley Miller	12/12/2024