

## **6.2 Community Coordinator Assessment Grid**

### **NATIONAL ASSESSMENT GRID FOR COMMUNITY COORDINATOR (OF-Wage Subsidy, OF- Work Experience, OF-Self-Employment, OF-Skills for Employment, OF-Enhanced Employment Assistance Services - including client assessment and case management) AGREEMENTS**

**CFP-ON-0910-NSEW-Ontario-002**

<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>CSGC Project #</b>
<b>Assessor:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>Application Eligibility:</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
1. Application received no later than stated closing date/time for this CFP.		
2. All the required documents provided as specified in the Guide for Applicants and Applicant has provided 4 paper copies of complete application package, plus 1 diskette.)		
3. References (person with knowledge of the organizations financial and skill capacity - full name, address and telephone number provided)		
4. Original application signed by organization's legal signing authority(-ies)		
5. Applicant meets eligibility criteria ( <b>outlined in Section 2.1. 5) of the Guide for Applicants</b> ).		
6. Proposal meets CFP requirements in terms of clients identified and range of funding and location(s) of service outlined in the CFP.		
<i><b>If there is a "no" response to any of the questions above, this application will not be considered further.</b></i>		

	Max Score	% of Total
<b>A. Organizational Experience</b>		
<b>A1. Mandate and Client Focus:</b> The applicant has previously demonstrated experience in providing the requested services targeted to the client group identified by the CFP, <i>Persons with Disabilities</i> ; OR, in providing the requested or similar services to a different client group; OR, in providing different services to the identified client group. <b>(See Section 2.2 – A1 of the Guide for Applicants)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15%</b>
<p>Scoring Guide</p> <p>The applicant has experience delivering <i>OF- Wage Subsidy, OF-Work Experience, OF-Self-Employment, OF-Skills for Employment; OF-Enhanced Employment Assistant Services - including client assessment and case management</i> and supporting the needs of the client group, Persons with Disabilities, and the description provided is clear, complete and detailed. The applicant's mandate and background are described in detail and have demonstrated an appropriate and stable governance structure and financial stability.</p> <p>The applicant has some experience providing the desired services and supporting clients needs but to a lesser degree, or little information is given. The applicant's mandate and background are included but lack detail.</p> <p>The applicant has little or no experience delivering the desired services or supporting the particular client group. The applicant has provided no or little information on their mandate and background.</p>	<p><b>10-15</b></p> <p><b>6-9</b></p> <p><b>0-5</b></p>	
<b>A2. Past Projects and Their Achievements:</b> Past projects and their achievements (program results) indicate that the applicant has the organizational capacity to deliver the proposed service, including the appropriate internal policies and procedures to support the project (human resource planning, staff training and development, complaint resolution, IM/IT, conflict of interest guidelines, etc.). <b>(See Section 2.2 – A2 of the Guide)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10%</b>
<p><u>Note:</u> When assessing this factor references will also be considered.</p> <p>Scoring Guide</p> <p>The applicant has demonstrated success in achieving agreed-upon results on past projects and/or initiatives (more than one) funded by HRSDC / Service Canada or other funders.</p> <p>The applicant has delivered only one successful project OR has been only partially successful in achieving agreed-upon results on past projects/initiatives.</p> <p>The applicant has no experience delivering projects/initiatives of a similar nature, OR did not achieve the expected results, OR has provided little or no information.</p>	<p><b>7-10</b></p> <p><b>4-6</b></p> <p><b>0-3</b></p>	

<p><b>A3. Financial Management:</b> The applicant has demonstrated the ability to successfully administer/manage funding from HRSDC/Service Canada, other government departments, charitable organizations, and/or private sector partners. (See Section 2.2 – A3 of the Guide)</p>	5	5%
<p>Scoring Guide</p> <p>The applicant's financial controls and bookkeeping practices for previous projects are clearly described and were suitable for the project(s) in question.</p> <p>The applicant's (past) financial controls/bookkeeping practices appear sound, but the description lacks some elements.</p> <p>The applicant does not mention or had inadequate financial controls.</p>	4-5 2-3 0-1	
<b>Total – Organizational Experience</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>B. Proposed Service Delivery Approach and Activities</b>		
<p><b>B1.</b> The applicant's <b>plan to manage the project</b> includes clear objectives and a detailed implementation plan/workflow with appropriate and realistic milestones. Service will be provided in both official languages where required. (See Section 2.3 – B1 of the Guide)</p>	5	5%
<p>Scoring Guide</p> <p>Applicant's plan to manage project is clear, complete and will likely lead to successful implementation of the project: it contains monthly or quarterly milestones; it outlines a plan to monitor project achievements regularly and adjust activities if necessary. It includes tools and supports such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FOR Opportunities Fund (OF) Wage Subsidy (WS) referral and feedback mechanism with assessment centres/case managers if services are provided externally, assessment grid and selection process to determine suitability of clients for OF-WS, marketing strategy/outreach to employers, job development and job matching services, wage subsidy agreements with employers, temporary financial assistance for participants.</li> <li>• FOR OF-Work Experience (WE) referral and feedback mechanism with assessment centres/case managers if services are provided externally, assessment grid and selection process to determine suitability of clients for OF-WE, marketing strategy/outreach to clients, an identified process to determine temporary financial assistance for participants.</li> </ul>	4-5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FOR OF Self-Employment (SE) referral and feedback mechanism with assessment centres/case managers if services are provided externally, assessment grid and selection process to determine suitability of clients for OF-SE, marketing strategy/outreach to clients, an identified process to determine temporary financial assistance and type of business counselling required by participants.</li> <li>• FOR OF-Skills for Employment (SFE) referral and feedback mechanism with assessment centres/case managers if services are provided externally, assessment grid and selection process to determine suitability of clients for OF-SFE, marketing strategy/outreach to clients, an identified process to determine temporary financial assistance and type of business counselling required by participants.</li> <li>• FOR OF-Enhanced Employment Assistance Services (EEAS) referral and feedback mechanism with assessment centres/case managers if services are provided externally, assessment grid and selection process to determine suitability of clients for OF-EEAS, marketing strategy/outreach to clients, an identified process to determine temporary financial assistance</li> </ul>		

<p>and type of business counselling required by participants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project objectives are clear, concise, and achievable. Service will be provided in both official languages where required.</li> </ul> <p>Applicant's plan to manage project is somewhat clear, is missing some elements, and/or may need modifications in order to ensure successful implementation. Service will be provided in both official languages where required.</p> <p>Applicant's plan to manage project is unclear, is missing a number of essential elements, and will likely not be sufficient to ensure successful implementation. Service cannot be offered in the two official languages as required.</p>	<p><b>2-3</b></p> <p><b>0-1</b></p>	
<p><b>B2.</b> The proposal includes plans/activities on how <b>outcomes/results</b> outlined in the Guide will be achieved in the context of the project. The applicant has described a suitable plan to monitor achievement of results and adjust workplans as required. <b>(See Section 2.3 – B2 of the Guide)</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>	<p>5%</p>
<p>Scoring Guide</p> <p>Proposed results are clear, complete and measurable – for example: xxx of clients to be assisted; (must be within range specified for CFP),</p> <p>FOR OF-Enhanced Employment Assistance Services (including client assessment and case management), #/% of clients assessed, #/% of client's case managed, #/% of clients supported, #/% of clients who complete their intervention, and #/% of clients employed after completing their intervention, #/% returning to school.</p> <p>FOR OF-Wage Subsidy - #/% of placements with employers, #/% of clients employed after subsidy.</p> <p>FOR OF-Work Experience - #/% of clients who complete their work experience, and #/% of clients employed after their work experience, #/% returning to school.</p> <p>FOR OF-Skills for Employment - #/% of clients who complete their course, and #/% of clients employed after completing their course, #/% returning to school.</p> <p>FOR OF-Self Employment - #/% of clients who complete all phases of the program, and #/% of clients still in business after program, #/% returning to school.</p> <p>Applicant has appropriate system to measure, monitor and report participant progress and project success, including a plan to review and adjust activities if targets are not being met (participant/employer contacts or surveys at specified points to monitor client satisfaction and achievements, quality assurance reviews of client files, monthly project reports, mid-point review with community partners to assess project success, results are used to guide future planning).</p> <p>Proposed results are somewhat confusing, are missing some elements, and/or are not all measurable. Proposed system to measure, monitor, and report on project results is missing some elements, but could be adequate with a few minor modifications.</p> <p>Proposed results are unclear, not measurable, or missing a significant number of elements. Proposed system is unclear or missing a significant number of elements.</p>	<p><b>4-5</b></p> <p><b>2-3</b></p> <p><b>0-1</b></p>	
<p><b>B3.</b> The proposal includes appropriate <b>service standards</b> (e.g. client satisfaction, speed of service, quality, resource maintenance, handling complaints, resolving IT problems etc.). <b>(See Section 2.3 – B3 of the Guide)</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<p>3%</p>

Scoring Guide		
Applicant has clear and appropriate service standards related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• speed of service – e.g. wait time to access the program, management of the wait list, responding to inquiries, processing payment claims</li> <li>• quality – client service (courtesy, professionalism), client record-keeping, referrals to other agencies</li> <li>• handling complaints – review/oversight mechanism</li> <li>• resolving IT problems</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	
Applicant's service standards are somewhat confusing or are missing some elements.	<b>1-2</b>	
Applicant's service standards are unclear or are missing a significant number of elements.	<b>0</b>	
<b>B4. The facility to be used is suitable for the proposed activities (e.g. appropriate size and location, fully accessible). (See Section 2.3 – B4 of the Guide)</b>	<b>3</b>	3%
Scoring Guide		
Proposed facility is appropriate in terms of amount of space and accessibility for employees and clients. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• space for offices, meeting rooms, reception</li> <li>• space to ensure privacy during individual client sessions</li> <li>• accessible via public transit, and/or parking available</li> <li>• accessible to persons with disabilities</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	
Proposed facility is somewhat small and not as accessible.	<b>1-2</b>	
Proposed facility is inappropriate in terms of size and/or accessibility.	<b>0</b>	
<b>B5. Overall, the proposal is practical and feasible, and meets the objectives and priorities of the program. (See Section 2.3 – B5 of the Guide)</b>	<b>3</b>	3%
Scoring Guide		
Clear evidence that applicant understands the community and OF-WS/OF-SD/OF-SE criteria and priorities, and has an appropriate plan to handle clients who do not meet their program criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• applicant understands the eligibility criteria for the program and the program Ts &amp; Cs</li> <li>• activities are targeted to achieving results related to employment and unpaid benefits</li> <li>• applicant has plan to refer clients back to case managers when necessary.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	
Some evidence of above.	<b>1-2</b>	
Little or no evidence.	<b>0</b>	
<b>B6. Other Specifics to the CFP (See Section 2.3 – B6 of the Guide)</b>	<b>11</b>	11%
<b>A clear understanding and knowledge of the unique issues, needs and employment barriers faced by people with disabilities;</b>		
Scoring Guide		
Strong evidence that the applicant has a clear understanding of the complexity of the unique issues, needs and employment barriers faced by people with disabilities;	<b>3-4</b>	
Some evidence that the applicant has a limited understanding of the unique issues, needs and employment barriers faced by people with disabilities;	<b>1-2</b>	

Little or no evidence that the applicant has an understanding of the unique issues, needs and employment barriers faced by people with disabilities;	<b>0</b>	
<b>Evidence of existing infrastructure network allowing for service delivery in the Northern, South-Eastern, South-Western Regions of Ontario (excluding Hamilton/Niagara, York/Durham, Peel/Halton and Toronto Regions);</b> <i>Scoring Guide</i>		
Strong evidence that the applicant has an existing infrastructure network in place to deliver proposed activities in the targeted area;	<b>3</b>	
Limited Evidence that the applicant has an infrastructure network to deliver proposed activities in the targeted area.	<b>1-2</b>	
No evidence that the applicant has an existing infrastructure to carry out proposed activities in the targeted area;	<b>0</b>	
<b>Knowledge and awareness of various programs and services available to provide assistance to people with disabilities;</b> <i>Scoring guide</i>		
Strong evidence that the applicant has clear knowledge and awareness of various programs and services available to provide assistance to people with disabilities;	<b>2</b>	
Evidence that the applicant has limited knowledge and awareness of various programs and services available to provide assistance to people with disabilities;	<b>1</b>	
Little or no evidence that the applicant has any knowledge and awareness of various programs and services available to provide assistance to people with disabilities;	<b>0</b>	
<b>Evidence of a clear and comprehensive marketing and outreach strategy</b> <i>Scoring Guide</i>		
Strong evidence that the applicant has clear plan to market project activities and outreach to people with disabilities in the target area;	<b>2</b>	
Evidence that the applicant has clear plan to market project activities and outreach to people with disabilities in the target area;	<b>1</b>	
Little or no evidence that the applicant has clear plan to market project activities and outreach to people with disabilities in the target area;	<b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL – Service Delivery Approach and Activities</b>		<b>30%</b>
<b>C. Proposed Human Resource Plan</b>		
<b>C1.</b> The applicant has identified and provided a sound rationale for the <b>number and categories of staff</b> (management, officers, support staff) with clear roles and responsibilities based on scope of work/service delivery model. <b>(See Section 2.4 – C1 of the Guide)</b>	<b>3</b>	3%
<i>Scoring Guide</i>		
Ratio of management and staff appropriate. Ratio of staff to clients is appropriate based on the service delivery model involved.	<b>3</b>	
Ratio could be appropriate with minor modifications. Ratio of staff to clients may be appropriate with a few minor modifications.	<b>1-2</b>	
Ratio is inappropriate (e.g. significantly heavy in management or other staff). Ratio of staff to clients appears unreasonable, or unable to assess.	<b>0</b>	
<b>C 2.</b> The applicant has appropriate <b>human resource policies</b> in place for the project (e.g. pay and benefits, leave, professional development, travel, employment equity, accommodation for persons with disabilities, etc.). <b>(See Section 2.4 – C2 of the Guide)</b>	<b>2</b>	2%

Scoring Guide		
Applicant has appropriate human resource policies and procedures for the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pay and benefits</li> <li>• leave</li> <li>• professional development</li> <li>• travel</li> <li>• employment equity</li> <li>• accommodation for persons with disabilities</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	
HR policies and procedures are missing some elements, but could be adequate with a few minor modifications.	<b>1</b>	
HR policies and procedures are unclear or are missing a number of key elements.	<b>0</b>	
<b>C3.</b> The applicant already has <b>experienced/qualified project staff</b> with the appropriate job-related and language skills (English and/or French as appropriate), OR has a suitable plan to recruit and orient them (including details on required qualifications, hiring process, and training). <b>(See Section 2.4 – C3 of the Guide)</b>	<b>5</b>	5%
Scoring Guide		
Applicant has qualified and experienced project employees with appropriate job-related skills (manager/ coordinator, job developers, and/or support staff) on staff, OR has a suitable plan to recruit and orient them (including details on required qualifications, hiring process, training).. Applicant has the staff with the official language capacity to deliver activities/services.	<b>4-5</b>	
Applicant has recently identified project staff with suitable qualifications OR has a recruitment and orientation plan that may be suitable with a few modifications.	<b>2-3</b>	
Applicant has not yet identified project staff, and has not outlined a plan to recruit and train them.	<b>0-1</b>	
<b>TOTAL – Human Resource Plan</b>		<b>10%</b>
<b>D. Proposed Community/Labour Market Knowledge</b>		
<b>D1.</b> The applicant has demonstrated how the project links to labour market needs by clearly showing that the applicant understands the <b>labour market needs and priorities</b> and the <b>community</b> to be served. The applicant’s mandate relates directly or indirectly to the client group and/or activities targeted by this CFP. <b>(See Section 2.5 – D1 of the Guide)</b>	<b>5</b>	5%
Scoring Guide		
The proposal incorporates clear evidence that applicant understands the needs of the community to be served e.g. provides geographic, socio-economic, labour market data; understands both the supply and demand sides and has applied their knowledge in linking the particular project to the community needs.	<b>4-5</b>	
Some evidence.	<b>2-3</b>	
Little or no evidence.	<b>0-1</b>	

<b>D2.</b> The applicant has a suitable plan to <b>leverage</b> existing resources and programs in the community. <b>(See Section 2.5 – D2 of the Guide)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>
Scoring Guide Clear evidence that the applicant has applied their understanding of the existing resources in the community in a way that shows that clients will be supported appropriately. Some evidence. Little or no evidence.	<b>4-5</b> <b>2-3</b> <b>0-1</b>	
<b>TOTAL – Community/Labour Market Knowledge</b>		<b>10%</b>
<b>E. Budget</b>		
<b>E1.</b> The project costs are eligible, itemized, and reasonable and support the project activities either directly or indirectly (Budget Template, Cash Flow Forecast). EITHER the proposed activity does not involve subcontracting, OR the rationale and process for selecting sub-contractors is clear. <b>(See Section 2.6 – E1 of the Guide)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6%</b>
Scoring Guide Costs are itemized and directly relate to proposed activities and may require some negotiation. Cash flow is complete and reasonable in relation to proposed activities. Applicant’s proposal does NOT involve sub-contracting, OR applicant has a reasonable process to select the sub-contractors, so as to avoid any perception of conflict of interest and achieve value for money. Costs are itemized and most relate to proposed activities. Applicant’s process for selecting sub-contracting may be suitable with minor modifications. Costs aren’t clearly itemized and/or don’t relate to proposed activities. Applicant has not specified the process to be used to select the sub-contractors, or it is inadequate.	<b>5-6</b> <b>2-4</b> <b>0-1</b>	
<b>E2.</b> Participant costs (also known as Type 1.B. Costs) versus all other project costs (Type 1.A., 1.C. and 2. Costs) are reasonable OR within percentage range if stated and are reflective of prevailing rates within the community (Budget Template). <b>(See Section 2.6 – E2 of the Guide)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>
Scoring Guide Participant costs vs. all other project costs are reasonable in relation to overall project activities and costs. May require some negotiation. Participant costs vs. all project costs are high in relation to overall project activities and costs. Will require negotiation.	<b>2-3</b> <b>0-1</b>	
<b>E3.</b> Staff wage rates are within acceptable range according to local labour market information (Budget Template). The proponent should be identifying how wages fall within acceptable LMI. <b>(See Section 2.6 – E3 of the Guide)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>
Scoring Guide Proposed wages are reasonable and reflective of prevailing wage rates Proposed wages may be reasonable but require negotiation Proposed wages are unreasonable	<b>3</b> <b>1-2</b> <b>0</b>	
<b>E4.</b> Capital Costs and all other project costs are reasonable and relevant to the	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>

project (Budget Template, Cash Flow Forecast). ( <b>See Section 2.6 – E4 of the Guide</b> )		
Scoring Guide There are no capital costs, OR capital costs are necessary to achieve project objectives and are reasonable. There are capital costs necessary that require some modification. Capital costs are unnecessary in relation to project objectives or are unreasonable.	<b>3</b> <b>1-2</b> <b>0</b>	
<b>E5.</b> Sound administrative and financial management processes in place to manage project budget including adequate <b>financial controls</b> are in place for the project (e.g. re. separate bank accounts, good bookkeeping procedures, signing authorities, audits). ( <b>See Section 2.6 – E5 of the Guide</b> )	<b>4</b>	4%
Scoring Guide Clear evidence that applicant has adequate financial controls in place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• good bookkeeping procedures (with details on who and how often)</li> <li>• appropriate signing authorities</li> <li>• annual audited financial statement for public and non-profit entities, or access to an accounting services for for-profits</li> </ul> Some evidence; some elements missing. Little or no evidence.	<b>3-4</b> <b>1-2</b> <b>0</b>	
<b>E6.</b> The applicant or another funder is making a financial or in-kind <b>contribution</b> to the project and this contribution has been confirmed. ( <b>See Section 2.6 – E6 of the Guide</b> )	<b>1</b>	1%
Scoring Guide Applicant or other partners are making a financial contribution OR Applicant or other partners are making an in-kind contribution. Applicant's or other partners' contribution (in cash or in kind) represents _____% of total project costs. HRSDC/Service Canada is being requested to cover 100% of the project costs.	<b>1</b> <b>0</b>	
<b>TOTAL – Budget</b>		<b>20%</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

	Maximum Score	Applicant's Score
A – Organizational Experience	30	
B – Service Delivery Approach and Activities	30	
C – Human Resource Plan	10	
D – Community/Labour Market Knowledge	10	
E – Budget	20	
Grand Total (A+B+C+D+E)	100	
Percentage of Total	100%	
ADDITIONAL NOTES:		