

Request for Application Improvement

OBJECTIVE: To improve the DO-GMU RFA template and evaluation process

Area of Concern	Critique	Potential Solution	
Template	Lack of geographic asset mapping	Schedule GMAC time to discuss priority for funding, weights, geographic considerations, other fund considerations, and which data-sets will applicants be permitted to use to depict need	
	Consideration for need-based funding		
	Not clear direction on what priority of funding was		
	Importance of items and weights determined before RFA release, and then include in RFA		
	1 RFA encompasses too many topics		Break up funding streams and RFA by what service to f
	Not clear direction of how to complete the application		Provide workshop on the RFA with Q&A period
	Not a lot of formatted questions, instead asked for large documents (i.e., strategic plans, policies etc.)		Embed questions asking for a limited response (600 word etc.)
Evaluation	Too many applications, not enough reviewers, and not enough time	Increase reviewers, assign 6 (or more) randomized to each application.	
	Not provided an opportunity to discuss with peers the merits of each proposal during evaluation period	Extend the period of time each reviewer has with applications	
	More articulate leaders have more influence over group decisions	Schedule a reviewer meeting to discuss proposals Reviewer group will rank applications and provide to GMAC for consideration.	
	Proposals did not meet formatting requirements, should not have made it to review stage (too long, font too small to read etc.) and unnecessary information sent to reviewers	Perform an administrative review by GMU for pass or fail on technical requirements. Only send application sections needed as defined by rubric	
	Not clear direction on how to evaluate proposals	Provide workshop to reviewers	
	Poor phone and internet connections make it more difficult to interact and understand	Provide meeting space for reviewers to meet in person.	
	Evaluator should not determine what is relevant for funding – this should be clear in the RFA	Answer in RFA building, GMAC priority setting.	

	Applicants operated from different data sets	
	No consideration for programs already receiving funds for same activities	
Scoring	RFA, Score Matrix and Evaluation not in sync with each other	Stronger RFA with a crosswalk to each section. Workshop for reviewers
	Some reviewers talked about sections more important to them, but info not part of the RFA	Answer in RFA building, GMAC priority setting.
	Weights of the sections not consistent	Answer in RFA building, GMAC priority setting.
	Evaluator bias, not everyone scores the same	Increase the number of reviewers to 6 – randomize