

## Scoring Criteria for prior success with outcomes of CIP funding

### 1. Response Rate:

- Is the sample size of participants completing the outcome measurement tool sufficient to reliably generalize results to the total number of participants for the funded program, project, service or event? (e.g., If there were more than 100 participants, did at least half of them complete the outcome measurement tool? If there were fewer than 100 participants, did everyone complete the measurement tool?).

### 2. Outcome Alignment:

- Are reported outcomes consistent with the grant agreement (Schedule B) and are outcomes clearly stated, specific, and measurable?

### 3. Appropriateness of Measurement Tools:

- Are the tools suitable and reliable for accurately capturing the stated outcomes and is the sample size for the measurement method sufficient (considering qualitative vs. quantitative methods)?
  - *For instance, an organization may indicate that they used a focus group discussion to assess outcomes. However, upon review, they report that 200 participants indicated a positive change based on this method. This raises concerns about the reliability and accuracy of the data, given the qualitative nature of focus groups.*  
  
*Focus group discussions are typically designed to gather in-depth insights from a smaller, purposively selected group not to quantify responses from large populations. Claiming that 200 individuals provided measurable outcome data via a qualitative tool suggests either misapplication of the method or overstatement of findings. In such cases, the measurement tool may not be appropriate for the type of outcome being reported.*

### 4. Measure-to-Outcome Alignment:

- Do the measurement questions and methods directly assess the stated outcomes?

### The scores are:

- Not Applicable - N/A
- Not Met – 0
- Needs Work – 1 criterion met
- Needs Some Work - 2 criteria met
- Good – 3 criteria met
- Exemplary – 4 criteria met