

OPCSMH FY26 CCG

Appendix C: Proposal Scoring Tool

Criteria	Description	Scoring Guide	Score
<p>Strength of Campus-Community Collaboration</p>	<p>Proposal demonstrates a clear and intentional partnership between at least one institution of higher education and one or more community entities (e.g., mental health agencies, advocacy orgs, etc.). The Letter(s) of Support includes evidence of joint planning and implementation. Student involvement in proposal development and implementation is strongly encouraged when applicable.</p>	<p>0 = No evidence of collaboration.</p> <p>1–3 = Minimal evidence of collaboration (e.g., supporting letters only, no joint planning).</p> <p>4–6 = Project developed collaboratively, but only one entity will participate in implementation.</p> <p>7–8 = Both campus and community partners are involved, with some joint planning/implementation described.</p> <p>9–10 = Strong evidence of mutual planning and joint implementation by both campus and community partners; including student voices when applicable.</p>	<p>/10</p>
<p>Alignment with Grant Purpose</p>	<p>Proposal clearly supports suicide prevention, mental health promotion, and/or stigma reduction. It identifies relevant goals that are realistic within the funding period.</p>	<p>0 = No alignment with the grant purpose.</p> <p>1 = Vague or unclear connection to grant purpose.</p> <p>2–3 = Addresses the purpose with some clarity; goals are present but may lack feasibility or detail.</p> <p>4 = Clearly aligns with purpose and presents realistic, relevant goals.</p>	<p>/5</p>

		<p>5 = Strong alignment with purpose and well-articulated, achievable goals within the funding period.</p>	
<p>Use of Comprehensive Mental Health Approach</p>	<p>Proposal aligns with elements of the JED model (e.g., means safety, screening, gatekeeper training, crisis management, etc.) and uses best practices for safe language when reporting on suicide and suicide risk. Applicant selects at least one element and describes implementation.</p>	<p>0 = No use of JED framework or safe reporting elements.</p> <p>1 = Minimal mention of a relevant element(s) without implementation detail.</p> <p>2–3 = At least one element identified and generally described.</p> <p>4 = One or more elements selected with clear implementation plan.</p> <p>5 = Strong alignment with model and detailed plan for implementing elements meaningfully.</p>	<p>/5</p>
<p>Innovation</p>	<p>Proposal demonstrates a novel approach to addressing suicide prevention, mental health promotion, or stigma reduction. Shows originality and responsiveness to campus needs.</p>	<p>0 = No evidence of innovation.</p> <p>1–3 = Minimal innovation; replicates common or previously utilized approaches without adaptation.</p> <p>4–6 = Some novel aspects or adaptations to context.</p> <p>7–8 = Creative and responsive approach that builds on known strategies.</p> <p>9–10 = Highly innovative, original, and clearly tailored to address specific campus needs or gaps.</p>	<p>/10</p>
<p>Program Design and Implementation Plan</p>	<p>Clear description of the program activities, timeline, and responsible parties. Activities are feasible, culturally</p>	<p>0 = No program design or plan included.</p> <p>1–3 = Very limited or unclear plan; lacks details or feasibility.</p>	<p>/10</p>

	responsive, and appropriate for the prioritized population (students, staff, faculty).	<p>4–6 = Basic plan with timeline and roles; may lack cultural responsiveness or detail.</p> <p>7–8 = Clear, feasible plan with appropriate design and responsiveness to target audience.</p> <p>9–10 = Strong, detailed plan with realistic activities, timelines, and cultural competence for target populations.</p>	
Evaluation and Measurable Outcomes	Proposal includes a plan to evaluate outcomes. Goals and objectives are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART).	<p>0 = No evaluation or outcomes mentioned.</p> <p>1 = Vague or unmeasurable outcomes.</p> <p>2–3 = Some measurable goals and general evaluation plan.</p> <p>4 = Specific evaluation strategy and mostly SMART-aligned objectives.</p> <p>5 = Clear evaluation plan with fully developed SMART goals and meaningful outcome metrics. Proposal designates the person responsible for evaluation.</p>	/5
Budget Justification and Cost Effectiveness	Budget is detailed, appropriate for the scope of work, and cost-effective. Justification is clear and aligns with proposed activities.	<p>0 = No budget or justification included.</p> <p>1 = Budget is unclear or misaligned with proposed activities.</p> <p>2–3 = Basic budget included; may lack clarity or full justification.</p> <p>4 = Budget is appropriate and justified with clear linkage to activities.</p>	/5

		<p>5 = Budget is detailed, cost-effective, and fully justified in relation to the proposed work.</p>	
<p>Sustainability and Long-Term Impact</p>	<p>Proposal describes how the project will have an impact beyond the grant period. Includes plans for sustaining partnerships or programming.</p>	<p>0 = No sustainability plan provided.</p> <p>1 = Very limited mention of sustainability.</p> <p>2–3 = Some plan for continuing activities or partnerships but lacks detail.</p> <p>4 = Clear plan for sustaining efforts or outcomes beyond the funding period.</p> <p>5 = Strong, feasible plan for long-term impact, including sustained partnerships and/or program continuation.</p>	<p>/5</p>
<p>Total Score:</p>			<p>/ 50</p>