

Appendix B: Scoring Detail

Criterion #1: Organizational Capacity (up to 20 points)

Factors considered include:

- Applicant's ability to successfully complete the proposed project in a timely manner
- Applicant's experience providing programs or services related to food access and/or food security, including but not limited to food distribution, nutrition education, local agriculture, and/or food retail (such programming may be different than the food security or food access activities proposed for the grant)
- Applicant's experience successfully executing projects similar in scale and budget
- Applicant's experience serving the target population in the selected FDC(s) or other populations with similar attributes
- Among food retail projects, applicant's experience serving recipients of federal and state nutrition benefits, including SNAP and WIC
- As applicable for the proposed project, applicant's experience working effectively on collaborative, multi-stakeholder projects

Criterion #1 will be measured using the scale below:

- 1–10 points: Applicant demonstrates minimal capacity and experience related to the proposed project
- 11–15 points: Applicant demonstrates moderate capacity and experience related to the proposed project
- 16–20 points: Applicant demonstrates superior capacity and experience related to the proposed project

Criterion #2: Project Impact (up to 20 points)

Factors considered include:

- Potential impact of proposed project on food access and/or food security for residents of selected FDC(s)
- Clarity, specificity, cogency, and thoughtfulness of overall project description and goals
- Breadth of potential impact, as shown by estimated number of people to be served
- Depth of potential impact, as shown by the level or frequency of services to be provided, and/or by the project's potential impact on populations within selected FDC(s)
- Applicant's understanding of food access needs and challenges in selected FDC(s) — and how proposed project directly relates to these needs and challenges
- Potential impact of the proposed project on advancing the applicant's overall mission or primary line of business

Criterion #2 will be measured using the scale below:

- 1–10 points: Application demonstrates minimal level of potential project impact
- 11–15 points: Application demonstrates moderate level of potential project impact
- 16–20 points: Application demonstrates superior level of potential project impact

Criterion #3: Work Plan Quality (up to 15 points)

Factors considered include:

- Comprehensiveness, clarity, and detail of work plan, including objectives, timeline/milestones, scope of work, estimates of resources needed and allocated, planned collaborators

- Feasibility and reasonableness of work plan as proposed, including timeline and milestones
- Evidence of thorough planning of activities to expand food access and/or food security for residents of selected FDC(s)
- Alignment between work plan and project description/goals

Criterion #3 will be measured using the scale below:

- 1–7 points: Work plan includes minimal detail on project activities, objectives, timeline and/or staffing
- 8–11 points: Work plan includes moderate detail on project activities, objectives, timeline and/or staffing
- 12–15 points: Work plan includes superior detail on project activities, objectives, timeline and/or staffing

Criterion #4: Project Viability and Sustainability (up to 15 points)

Factors considered include:

- Potential for project to remain viable and sustainable upon conclusion of NJEDA grant term
- Alignment of proposed project and funding request with applicant’s existing financial and administrative capabilities
- Evidence of ongoing or previous project planning (e.g. feasibility studies)
- Evidence of site control, a path to site control, or site use authorization
- Evidence applicant has considered potential risks to project success and contingencies for addressing these risks
- If applicable, evidence of commitment from project collaborators
- If applicable, evidence of engagement with key stakeholders needed for project success (e.g. suppliers)

Criterion #4 will be measured using the scale below:

- 1–7 points: Application demonstrates minimal level of project viability and sustainability
- 8–11 points: Application demonstrates moderate level of project viability and sustainability
- 12–15 points: Application demonstrates superior level of project viability and sustainability

Criterion #5: Community Engagement (up to 15 points)

Factors considered include:

- Applicant’s depth of experience/track record of serving residents of selected FDC(s)
- Applicant’s track record of seeking and responding to feedback from stakeholders, such as community members, customers, or advocates
- Proposed project-specific outreach and engagement activities
- Evidence of community support, as demonstrated through Letters of Support from one or more entities serving the selected FDC(s)
- Applicant’s ability to consider and mitigate obstacles that have created past challenges to community food access/food security in the selected FDC(s)

Criterion #5 will be measured using the scale below:

- 1–7 points: Application demonstrates minimal level of community engagement
- 8–11 points: Application demonstrates moderate level of community engagement
- 12–15 points: Application demonstrates superior level of community engagement

Criterion #6: Strength of Budget and Budget Narrative (up to 15 points, 8 point minimum required)

Factors considered include:

- Comprehensiveness, clarity, and detail of budget and budget narrative
- Strength of justification for proposed costs in budget narrative, as demonstrated through connection to food access and/or food security for residents of selected FDC(s)
- Reasonableness of proposed expenses and requested level of funding
- Alignment between budget, budget narrative, and work plan (i.e. proposed costs, planned outcomes, and project goals)
- If applicable, evidence and status of outside project funding, as demonstrated through the budget narrative
- If collaborating or partnering with other entities, strength of rationale for partnership and reasonableness of associated costs

Criterion #6 will be measured using the scale below:

- 1–7 points: Budget and budget narrative show minimal level of detail, connection to project goals, clarity of justification/explanation, and reasonableness
- 8–11 points: Budget and budget narrative show moderate level of detail, connection to project goals, clarity of justification/explanation, and reasonableness
- 12–15 points: Budget and budget narrative show superior level of detail, connection to project goals, clarity of justification/explanation, and reasonableness