MEMORANDUM

TO: Austin Community Technology & Telecommunications Commission
FROM: GTOPS 2016 Working Group via John Speirs, Digital Inclusion Program Coordinator, TARA
DATE: December 9, 2015
SUBJECT: **GTOPs 2016 Working Group Items**

The purpose of this memo is to reconcile previously recommended and approved from GTOPs Working Group to the Commission for ratification.

Purpose

Staff requests the Commission consider (3) items affecting scoring criteria adjusted after initial approval to accommodate the online system used to manage the grant review process and reconcile a sentence structure clarification. The changes, while menial, were substantive enough to merit a further reaffirmation from the Commission.

IV- Budget and fiscal responsibility - 30 total
   a) The Grant Review Committee Scoring Criteria Change to accommodate the online system scoring capability: Option 2: Recommend maximum of range of 3,6,10,12,14,15 to get to 15.
   b) Staff recommends approving sentence structure improvement for 15 Point Criteria: Score of 14: *Little* Concern~~s~~ regarding organization's ability to manage funds and matching funds appropriately ~~are alleviated by program plan and documentation about current capabilities of organization to manage funds and matching funds appropriately.~~

III - Evaluation of Success - 25 total
   a) Staff recommends the Commission approve a voluntary narrative input box to fulfill *non-scored sub criteria* for III - Evaluation of Success - 25 total
      (i) The organization has provided documentation of demonstrated success as an organization *(10 pts):*
         1. New to GTOPs: Success in similar programs or of proposed staff and volunteers executing program plan. (NARRATIVE INPUT BOX FOR COMMENTS BY REVIEWERS)
         2. Former GTOPs: Historical reviews of programs funded through GTOPs. (NARRATIVE INPUT BOX FOR COMMENTS BY REVIEWERS)

Recommendation

The recommended changes remain in line with the original spirit and objectives of the Working Group recommendations approved by the Commission at the October 14, 2015 Regular Meeting. Staff recommends the Commission approve the necessary changes of the final scoring criteria.

Attachments
Exhibit (A) *GTOPs 2016 Grant Review Committee Orientation*

Grant for Technology Opportunities Program Review Board Orientation

Staff Contacts:

John Speirs: john.speirs@austintexas.gov

Allan McCracken (CTK System Administrator):

allan.mccracken@austintexas.gov

Sharla Chamberlain: sharla.chamberlain@austintexas.gov

December 16, 2015

2016 GTOPs Grant

GTOPs provides matching funds to Austin organizations and citizens' groups for projects focusing on use of information technology and connecting our citizens with computers and the Internet.

2016 Grant

- TOTAL funds available of $200,000

- Grants are between $10,000 and $25,000

- Awarded by rank, according to program priority category, based on your scores

- Scored on 100 point scale using 10 weighted questions

- Two rounds of scoring

GTOPS
GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

2016 GTOPs Grant

GTOPs Goals:

- Provide public access to computers and information technology, especially among underserved segments of our community.

- Provide information technology literacy, education, and training.

- Use information and communication technologies in innovative ways to serve the Austin community.

- Address the **2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan Goals**.

The Process

Written Evaluations – Round 1
- Preliminary evaluation and elimination
- Written questions to applicants (DUE Jan 10, 2016)
- Responses from applicants (DUE Jan 18, 2016)
- Round 1 Scores (DUE Jan 31, 2016)

Oral Presentations – Round 2
- FEB 12, 2016 from top 20 (or less)
- Five minute presentations followed by five minutes of Q&A
- Five minutes of discussion time

GTOPS
GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

The Process

Finishing Up

Scoring Round 2 (Feb 12, 2016) (Oral Presentations)

- Group meeting (February, 2016) (tentative)

  - review scores and rankings

  - discussion and adjustments if needed

  - discussion to determine final award amounts, based on ranking

Consensus

- True consensus is achieved when all reviewers give a similar score to a proposal

- Consensus increases confidence that a proposal has been accurately reviewed per criteria

- Consensus is not required -- we can agree to disagree so long as we understand why

- Consensus is achieved through discussion at: oral presentations, final meeting

Confidentiality, Communication & Impartiality

Your Identity

- Your review is a matter of public record. In order to allow judging with out bias or reprisal all forms and communications will be deidentified by the use of a confidential numbering system.

- Your number is in your orientation packet.

Communication with applicants

- Please do NOT communicate directly with applicants. Send any questions to me via email with a title such as "Reviewer 1 Question for Applicant #5." I will forward them, deidentified, to the program contact and post question via mass reply all to the reviewers when all responses are received, by the deadline.

- It is better to address specific and/or complex questions in writing BEFORE the oral presentations.

GTOPS
GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

Confidentiality, Communication & Impartiality

Judging without bias

- Please review and sign the Certification of Understanding.

- Judging matrix will clearly designate "Recused" or "R" on the report. (Online form exception)

Scoring and Comments

- Your scores are not only a matter of public record but will be shared with the applicants as a way to provide feedback.

- Please be constructive and concise in your comments.

- Experience shows that applicants take constructive reviewer feedback seriously, and return in succeeding years with improved proposals.

- Inappropriate or inflammatory language will not be accepted.

Selection Criteria

- Clearly **define the problem(s)** within the community to be served

- Address the needs of technologically **underserved populations**

- **Demonstrate** that the proposed program is **well planned and ready** for implementation, the budget is a reliable representation of the project's planned expenses and that the proposed match is secure and ready to expend

- Show **benefits to the neighborhood(s) or community**

- **Promote interaction** of many parts of the community (e.g. business and residents, people of different income levels, ages, racial and ethnic groups)

- **Provide opportunities for volunteerism and participation** in the planning and implementation by those the project will serve

- Align with the **goals** of the **2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan**

(continued)

Selection Criteria (continued)

- Plan for **building community awareness** and knowledge of the program

- Illustrate the **vitality of the organization** as a whole and the sustainability of the program, if applicable

- Provide a **creative and practical means** of addressing the community's problem

- Identify anticipated **outcomes** and potential impacts that are both **realistic and measurable**

- Clearly describe what **technology will be used for the program** and its appropriateness given the goal(s) of the project

- Provide for **equipment maintenance, support and replacement**

- Illustrate a **lasting/on-going benefit to the community**

Online Forms & Applications

The judging process – Scoring by the numbers

- Questions are weighted by a points value

- Overall scores are graded by the 100 points scale

- Zeros should only be given if a question was left blank, is completely unreadable or nonsensical

- Full marks (100%) should only be given to perfectly written, thorough and complete answers

GTOPS

GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

Application Scoring Criteria

Goals of Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan

- Understand and Increase Usage of Digital and Communications Technology
- Address Potential Barriers to Digital Inclusion
- Develop programs to address need for Digital Literacy Training
- Develop programs to address need for Access via Reliable & Affordable Devices
- Develop programs to address Need for Language & Disability Accommodations
- Develop Relevancy & Advocacy Campaigns Within Specific Communities & Populations

I.---- 2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan Goals - 15 total
- This program plan has demonstrated alignment with the 2014 Digital Inclusion Strategic Plan. *(15 pts)*

Application Scoring Criteria

Basic Scoring for Criteria with 15 pts for I.1:

1. Does not address any goals of DI Strat. Plan.
2. Addresses issues that surround the goals of the DI Strat Plan.
3. Continuation of program previously funded; does not address current goals of DI Strat Plan.
4. Touches on one goal of DI Strat. Plan.
5. Touches on multiple goals.
6. Touches on two or more goals
7. Directly addresses one goal.
8. Directly addresses two goals
9. Directly addresses two goals and touches upon one other goal
10. Directly addresses three goals
11. Directly addresses three goals and touches upon one other goal
12. Directly addresses four goals
13. Directly addresses four goals and touches upon one other goal
14. Directly addresses five goals and touches upon one other goal
15. Directly Addresses six goals

GTOPS
GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

Application Scoring Criteria

II.---- Community impact - 30 total

- The program plan and its objectives are well defined and serve a community need. *(10 pts)*
- This program plan demonstrates that if implemented it will have an ongoing/lasting positive impact on the community. *(10 pts)*
- This program plan has demonstrated that it has collaboration partners w/ in the community we are seeking to serve. *(10 pts)*

III.---- Evaluation of success - 25 total

- This program has a clear plan for success. Its goals and objectives are achievable and its work plan is feasible. *(10 pts)*
- This program plan demonstrates its ability to evaluate its own success and reviewers agree that its proposed measures for evaluation are viable and appropriate. *(5 pts)*
- The organization has provided documentation of demonstrated success as an organization *(10 pts):*
  - New to GTOPs: Success in similar programs or of proposed staff and volunteers executing program plan. (NARRATIVE INPUT BOX FOR COMMENTS BY REVIEWERS)
  - Former GTOPs: Historical reviews of programs funded through GTOPs. (NARRATIVE INPUT BOX FOR COMMENTS BY REVIEWERS)

Application Scoring Criteria

Basic Scoring for Criteria with 10 pts:

0.0 Does not fit criteria.

1.0 Fits with major weaknesses.

2.0 Fits with moderate weaknesses

3.0 Fits with minor weaknesses.

4.0 Fits with no discernible weaknesses; not remarkable.

5.0 Strong with moderate weaknesses.

6.0 Strong with minor weaknesses

7.0 Strong with no discernible weaknesses.

8.0 Extremely strong with moderate weaknesses.

9.0 Extremely strong with minor weaknesses.

10.0 Perfectly fits criteria and goals.

Basic Scoring for Criteria with 5 pts:

0.0 Does not fit criteria.

1.0 Fits with major weaknesses.

2.0 Fits with no discernible weaknesses; not remarkable.

3.0 Strong with moderate weaknesses.

4.0 Extremely strong with moderate weaknesses.

5.0 Perfectly fits criteria and goals.

GTOPS

GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

Application Scoring Criteria

IV.---- Budget and fiscal responsibility - 30 total
- The organization that is executing on the program plan is a fiscally responsible organization that will use City funds and matching criteria of the grant appropriately if awarded this grant. *(15 pts)*
- This program plan has provided all required documentation, including its budget, which clearly shows its annual revenue and matching dollars (in-kind and/or cash). *(10 pts)*
- The program plan outlines a plan for sustainability of the program beyond the GTOPs grant. *(5 pts)*

GTOPS
GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

Application Scoring Criteria

Basic Scoring for Criteria with 15 pts for IV.1:

3 pts. No faith in organization's ability to manage funds and matching funds appropriately.

6 pts. Grave concerns about organization's ability to manage funds and matching funds appropriately.

10 pts. Prior track record raises concern of organization's ability to manage funds and matching funds appropriately.

12 pts. Some concerns regarding organization's ability to manage funds and matching funds appropriately.

14 pts. Little concern regarding organization's ability to manage funds and matching funds appropriately

15 pts. No question organization will manage funds and matching funds appropriately.

GTOPS
GRANT FOR TECHNOLOGY OPPORTUNITIES

Digital Inclusion Team Contact

Digital Inclusion
City of Austin

- austintexas.gov/digitalinclusion
- @COADigInclusion
- digital.inclusion@austintexas.gov

- John Speirs, Program Coordinator
  - John.speirs@austintexas.gov
  - 512.974.3510

- Sharla Chamberlain, Program Specialist
  - Sharla.chamberlain@austintexas.gov
  - 512.974.7676

- Allan McCracken (CTK System Administrator)
  - allan.mccracken@austintexas.gov
  - 512.972.5075