

# FARMERS MARKET AND LOCAL FOOD PROMOTION PROGRAM

---

## TURNKEY SCORING MATRIX

This matrix may be used by reviewers when assessing the applications for the Farmers Market Promotion Program (FMPP) and Local Food Promotion Program (LFPP) Turnkey applications (Turnkey Marketing and Promotion AND Turnkey Recruitment and Training). The matrix is based on the review criteria published in the program RFA.

This matrix is **not** applicable to non-Turnkey FMPP (Capacity Building, Community Development Training and Technical Assistance) and LFPP (Planning and Implementation) project types.

	DESCRIPTOR				
CRITERIA	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	POOR
Score →	21 – 25	15 – 20	8 – 14	1 – 7	0
<b>Technical Merit</b>  25 Points	<p>Clear, well-conceived, work plan. Work plan contains measurable or quantifiable activities that relate directly to the pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>Applicants must address a minimum of 3 and maximum of 5, pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>Implementation schedule is realistic. Effort attributed to personnel and contractual entities is reasonable.</p> <p>If previously funded, incorporates lessons learned. No deficiencies.</p>	<p>Work plan is clear and relates directly to the proposed project. Work plan contains measurable or quantifiable activities that relate directly to the pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>Applicants must address a minimum of 3 and maximum of 5, pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>Implementation schedule is realistic. Effort attributed to personnel and contractual entities is reasonable.</p> <p>If previously funded, incorporates lessons learned. Minor deficiencies.</p>	<p>The work plan generally outlines the applicant's goals and intent and contains measurable or quantifiable activities. However, the relation of some activities to the pre-defined project's objectives could be clarified.</p> <p>Applicants must address a minimum of 3 and maximum of 5, pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>Implementation schedule is feasible. Effort attributed to personnel and contractual entities is reasonable.</p> <p>If previously funded, incorporates lessons learned. Few deficiencies.</p>	<p>Work plan contains measurable or quantifiable activities, but the relation of several activities to the pre-defined project's objectives is unclear.</p> <p>Applicants must address a minimum of 3 and maximum of 5, pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>For the most part, implementation schedule is feasible. Effort attributed to personnel and contractual entities is reasonable.</p> <p>If previously funded, attempt made to incorporate lessons learned. Several deficiencies.</p>	<p>Work plan omits discussion of three (3) or more pre-defined objectives. Work plan is vague and/or confusing.</p> <p>Applicants must address a minimum of 3 and maximum of 5, pre-defined objectives.</p> <p>Implementation schedule is difficult to understand, unrealistic or not discussed. Effort attributed to personnel and contractual entities is questionable or unreasonable.</p> <p>If previously funded, proposed project does little or nothing to incorporate lessons learned. Major deficiencies.</p>

### Technical Merit Questions

- Does the application present a clear, well-conceived, and overall suitable work plan for fulfilling the pre-defined objectives of the proposed project?
  - Strength
  - Weakness
- Does the application present a realistic schedule for implementing the pre-defined project objectives during the award project period?
  - Strength
  - Weakness
- If the project and/or entity was previously funded, to what extent were the previous lessons learned incorporated into the proposed project?
  - Strength
  - Weakness
- Is the level of effort attributed to personnel and contractual entities detailed in the application at a reasonable level to conduct the proposed project?
  - Strength
  - Weakness

- Does the application work plan contain measurable or quantifiable tasks that relate directly to the pre-defined objectives of the proposed project?
  - Strength
  - Weakness

	DESCRIPTOR				
CRITERIA	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	POOR
Score →	21 – 25	15 – 20	8 – 14	1 – 7	0
<b>Achievability</b>  25 Points	<p>Selected outcomes and indicator(s) estimated values are appropriate for the scale and scope of the project. The project is extremely likely to succeed based on the proposed activities (listed on the work plan), and selected performance measures.</p> <p>No deficiencies.</p>	<p>Selected outcomes and indicator(s) estimated values are mostly appropriate for the scale and scope of the project. The project is likely to succeed based on the proposed activities (listed on the work plan), and selected performance measures.</p> <p>Minor deficiencies.</p>	<p>Selected outcomes and indicator(s) estimated values are feasible for the scale and scope of the project. The project may succeed based on the proposed activities (listed on the work plan), and selected performance measures.</p> <p>Few deficiencies.</p>	<p>Selected outcomes and indicator(s) estimated values are unclear for the scale and scope of the project. The proposed project has a slight chance to succeed, but it is difficult to tell what degree.</p> <p>Several deficiencies.</p>	<p>Selected outcomes and indicator(s) estimated values are not appropriate for the scale and scope of the project. The project might have difficulties in fulfilling the proposed activities (listed on the work plan), and selected performance measures.</p> <p>Major deficiencies.</p>

### **Achievability Questions**

- Are the Outcomes and Indicators appropriate for the scale and scope of work proposed?
  - Strength
  - Weakness

	DESCRIPTOR				
CRITERIA	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	POOR
Score →	21 – 25	15 – 20	8 – 14	1 – 7	0
<b>Expertise and Partners</b>  25 Points	<p>Application includes Letters of Commitment from all project partners and collaborators. Application details key staff and team members, including expertise and experience. Describes plans for coordination, communication, and data sharing and reporting.</p> <p>Partners are actively engaged in the project and have a vested interest in helping the applicant fulfill the project's activities and outcomes.</p> <p>No deficiencies.</p>	<p>Application includes Letters of Commitment from all project partners and collaborators. Application details key staff and team members, including expertise and experience. Describes plans for coordination, communication, and data sharing and reporting.</p> <p>Partners are engaged in the project and have an interest in the applicant fulfilling the project's activities and outcomes.</p> <p>Minor deficiencies.</p>	<p>Application may not include all Letters of Commitment from all project partners and collaborators. Application details key staff and team members, including expertise and experience. Describes plans for coordination, communication, and data sharing and reporting.</p> <p>Partnerships are mentioned, tangential and therefore not fully engaged in the project and it's not clear what role they will play.</p> <p>Few deficiencies.</p>	<p>Application includes some Letters of Commitment from project partners and collaborators. Application details key staff and team members, including expertise and experience. Describes plans for coordination, communication, and data sharing and reporting.</p> <p>There are few partnerships and if provided at all, are tangential or not included in the work plan/ approach.</p> <p>Several deficiencies.</p>	<p>Application does not include Letters of Commitment from project partners and collaborators. Application lacks details on key staff and team members. Does not describe plans for coordination, communication, and data sharing and reporting.</p> <p>Minimal or no commitment to collaboration, engagement, or participation.</p> <p>Major deficiencies.</p>

### Expertise and Partners Questions

- Does the proposed project represent substantial, effective, diverse, and strong qualifications of the applicant (individual and team) and the relevant partnerships and collaborators to accomplish the project's goals and objectives and to meet the needs of the intended beneficiaries? Please consider:
  - a. Commitment from the key partner and/or collaborators demonstrated through Letters of Commitment from Partner and Collaborator Organizations; If the application does not provide Letters of Commitment for all partners and collaborators described in the project narrative, reduce the score for the criterion. The amount of point for reduction is at the discretion of the reviewer depending on how it affects the ability to evaluate the application.
  - b. The key staff who will be responsible for managing the projects and names and titles of the individuals who comprise the Project Team; and
  - c. The expertise and experience of the Project Team necessary to successfully manage and implement the proposed project.
    - Strength
    - Weakness
- Does the application describe plans for coordination, communication, and data sharing and reporting among members of the Project Team and stakeholder groups, including both internal applicant personnel and external partners and collaborators?
  - Strength
  - Weakness



- Does the application describe a commitment to collaboration and engagement among partners to ensure high levels of participation or provides a clear and concise plan for how such engagement will occur?
  - Strength
  - Weakness

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTOR				
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	POOR
Score →	21 – 25	15 – 20	8 – 14	1 – 7	0
<b>Fiscal Plan and Resources</b>  25 Points	<p>Budget provides a clear, detailed, narrative description for each budget line item including how the budget is consistent with the size and scope of the project, and how it relates to the overall project narrative.</p> <p>If applicable, the application provides evidence that critical resources and infrastructure are in place.</p> <p>Application includes Letters of Matching Funds verifying sources and demonstrate how valuations were established. No deficiencies.</p>	<p>Budget provides a clear, detailed, narrative description for each budget line item including how the budget is consistent with the size and scope of the project, and how it relates to the overall project narrative.</p> <p>If applicable, the application provides evidence that critical resources and infrastructure are in place.</p> <p>Application includes Letters of Matching Funds verifying sources and demonstrate how valuations were established. Minor deficiencies.</p>	<p>Budget provides a description for each budget line item, including how the budget is consistent with the size and scope of the project, and how it relates to the overall project narrative.</p> <p>If applicable, the application provides evidence that critical resources and infrastructure are in place.</p> <p>Application includes Letters of Matching Funds verifying sources and demonstrate how valuations were established. Few deficiencies.</p>	<p>Budget provides a description for each budget line item. Line items relate to the overall project. Budget is generally consistent with the size and scope of the project.</p> <p>If applicable, the application provides evidence that critical resources and infrastructure are in place.</p> <p>Application includes Letters of Matching Funds verifying most sources and demonstrate how valuations were established. Several deficiencies.</p>	<p>Budget does not provide a clear description for each budget line item. Unclear how some line items relates to the overall project. Budget is inconsistent with the size and scope of the project.</p> <p>The application does not provide evidence that applicable critical resources or infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>Application does not include Letters of Matching Funds, or Letters do not verify funding sources or do not demonstrate how valuations were established. Major deficiencies.</p>

### **Fiscal Plan and Resources Questions**

- Does the application budget narrative or justification provide a clear, detailed, narrative description for each budget line item? Please consider:
  - a. How the budget is consistent with the size and scope of the project; and
  - b. How the budget relates logically to the narrative describing the project.
    - Strength
    - Weakness
- Does the application provide evidence that critical resources and infrastructure that are necessary for the initiation and completion of the proposed project are currently in place? If applicable to the proposed project and the application does not provide evidence that critical resources and infrastructure necessary for the project are not in place, reduce the score for the criterion. The amount of point for reduction is at the discretion of the reviewer depending on how it affects the ability to evaluate the application.
  - Strength
  - Weakness
- Does the applicant demonstrate that its partners' or collaborators' contribution of non-Federal cash resources or in-kind contributions are available and obtainable for the project as evidenced through the submitted Matching Funds and Letters of Verification? If the application does not provide Letters Verifying Match to support all matching funds detailed in the project narrative budget, reduce the score for the criterion. The amount of point for reduction is at the discretion of the reviewer depending on how it affects the ability to evaluate the application.
  - Strength
  - Weakness