

OSPI Child Nutrition Services Information Sheet

2023 Summer Meals for Kids Grant Scoring Matrix

The Washington State legislature annual funding for the Summer Meals for Kids grant. This is a competitive grant for Summer Food Service Program sponsors. Each grant proposal is scored based on the following information and may receive up to 100 total points.

SFSP Sponsor/Site Information Section

Question Number	Question	Points
1.2	If/when Sponsor received a Meals for Kids Grant 5 points = Never received a grant 3 points = Received grant in 2020 or prior 1 points = Received grant in 2021 or 2022	1 – 5
1.3	If site is a Rural Site as defined by USDA	0 pts -or- 3 pts
1.4	Focus of Grant - This grant will aim to do the following (Select all that Apply) 3 points = Increase the number of sites serving Summer Meals 3 points = Increase reach of existing site through meal delivery or other means 2 points = Increase the number of meals served 1 points = Promote the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) 1 points = Provide staff training 2 points = Improve the safety, meal quality, or efficiency of equipment or small wares	0 – 12



Narrative Questions Section

Question Number	Question	Points
2.2	What is the problem you are trying to solve? – Not Scored, just for context for narrative questions.	N/A
2.3	<p>In 1-2 short sentences, what is your plan to solve the problem and the equipment you need?</p> <p>Example: <i>We plan to purchase a food truck to take summer meals directly to where children gather.</i></p>	0 – 15
2.4	<p>Describe in detail your project and how the equipment will help you to meet your project goal of expanding sites, increasing participation, improving meal quality, promoting summer programs and/or providing training and outreach.</p> <p>Example: <i>The food truck will provide hot meals at two new locations. Additionally, the food truck will serve as a mobile advertisement for our summer meal program.</i></p>	0 – 15
2.5	<p>What is the expected impact of your project/plan/equipment purchase? How will the purchase(s) or project improve meal access and impact the number of children participating in the SFSP? Be specific and provide the projected increase in participation.</p> <p>Example: <i>We anticipate an increase of 30% in participation with this purchase based on our increased advertisement and the housing data in the area.</i></p>	0 – 15
2.6	<p>What is the timetable to get your project completed by the deadline (June 30, 2023)?</p> <p>Example: <i>Once awarded, we will immediately purchase the food truck from the vendor with the lowest quoted price. The food truck is fully equipped to safely store hot and cold food all day and has an awning to serve meals in a covered space.</i></p>	0 – 15
2.7	<p>List any partners or other sources of money to assist funding this project and how their participation will impact the project. (If you are not partnering with another organization, type N/A.)</p> <p>Example: <i>While we do not have the funds to purchase the food truck, we do have a certified mechanic who will maintain the truck. We also have received donation pledges to pay for the cost of insurance, vehicle registration, and tabs for the first three years of owning the food truck.</i></p>	0 – 15

Quotes Section

Question Number	Question	Points
3.1	<p>Three quotes for each item must be submitted with the grant proposal, if applicable. Each item requested must be prioritized and listed separately.</p> <p>For items over \$10,000: 5 points = 3 quotes 0 points = No quotes</p> <p>Items under \$10,000: Quotes are not required; however, sponsor can submit at least one quote for non-required items for 5 additional points.</p>	0 or 5 points

Narrative Question Scoring

0-15 Points	Rationale
0-1	Poor – not explained/marginally established, needs more specifics to be fully funded
5	Average – acceptable response/described approach sufficiently to be considered as meeting minimum requirements
10	Good – above-average response/described in sufficient detail to be considered as exceeding minimum requirements, has some specifics as to support the grant request, considers the work of stakeholders, somewhat collaborative
15	Excellent – superior, highlights innovation, detailed, cites specific data, efficient response/described approach in sufficient detail, very collaborative, considers other partners such as parents, students, teachers, local policy makers, or other organizations with an interest in improving children’s health and wellness outcomes.