

Adopt-a-Field Application Rating Sheet – Rater Guidelines

Criterion 1 – Experienced User (5 points)

- The user is a known entity, has proven to be a responsive and responsible user that has adhered to guidelines for use of public fields,
- The user has been willing and able in the past to satisfactorily resolve any issues that have arisen resulting from their use of public fields.

5 Points – The user has a history of a successful AAF experience and/or has been granted permits for use of fields for more than two years, has demonstrated no serious breaches of facility use guidelines and has resolved problems brought to their attention effectively and on a timely basis.

4 Points – The user is a relatively new entity having been granted permits for only a season or two of use, but has demonstrated no serious breaches of facility use guidelines and has resolved problems brought to their attention effectively and on a timely basis and/or has a history of AAF involvement that has been reasonably successful, but with minimal issues that were successfully resolved.

3 Points – The user is either a known entity or a relatively new entity, but has demonstrated an occasional serious breach of field use guidelines. However, the group has also fully and effectively addressed problems brought to their attention on a timely basis and like problems have not been repeated and/or the user has adopted fields previously but with limited success.

2 Points – The user is either a known entity or a relatively new entity, but has demonstrated an occasional serious breach of field use guidelines. The entity has only partially accepted responsibility for addressing problems and/or resolutions have lagged. Some issues have arisen on multiple occasions; and/or the user has previously adopted fields, but the arrangement was problematic.

1 Point– The overall pattern of use is not responsive or responsible as demonstrated somewhat routine minor breaches of guidelines that are repeated and go largely unaddressed; and/or the entity has been previously involved in the adoption of a field, but the arrangement was fraught with significant problems.

0 Points – The overall pattern of use is fully not responsive or responsible, as demonstrated by repeated, sometimes serious, violations of guidelines, some of which represent safety concerns or otherwise serve to demonstrate the user has general approach of non-compliance; and/or the entity has been previously involved in the adoption of a field, but the arrangement was terminated by the owner due to non-compliance.

Criterion 2 – Community Support/Engagement (5 points)

- Entities wanting to enter into an AAF arrangement must be a Montgomery County entity and must ensure that 2/3 of those participating in programs to be conducted on the field to be adopted are Montgomery County residents.
- Weight will be assigned based on the overall number of persons to be served and that hence will benefit from the AAF agreement.
- Weight will be assigned by MCPS to proposals that focus upon service to youth.

- Weight will be given to proposals that document plans to serve underserved populations.
- Weight will be assigned to proposals that promote open access to participants. In other words, weight will be assigned that recognizes entities that promote open access to the organization's activities to all participants, regardless of skill level, age, or income level.
- Weight will be given to entities with documented non-profit status.
- Entities wishing to offer a 'value added' to their AAF arrangement should outline their plan in their application. Selection panels will weigh such proposals as part of the overall selection process, but no specific weight will be given.

5 Points – Entity has documented 501C status and has a history of serving large number of participants and/or target populations that are county residents. Moreover, the entity provides open access to participants and where fees are required provides some form of assistance to ensure ability to pay is not the only consideration for participation

4 Points – Entity is not a 501C organization but has a history of serving large number of participants and/or target populations that are county residents. Moreover, the entity provides open access to participants and where fees are required provides some form of assistance to ensure ability to pay is not the only consideration for participation.

3 Points – Entity is either a 501C or not, serves a limited number of county residents/target populations. Moreover, the entity provides reasonable access to programming regardless of skill level or ability to pay, but the greater focus appears to be on competence and/or financial ability to pay. Some limited form of financial assistance is available.

2 Points – Entity is not based in Montgomery County and does not prioritize county residents/target populations. Acceptance into programs is almost fully skill-based and generally requires significant financial resources. Some minimal program exists for financial aide.

1 Point - Entity is neither Montgomery County based, nor prioritizes county residents for participation, which is based exclusively on skill level and ability to pay. Financial aide is either not available or is extremely limited.

0 Points – Entity is commercial in nature and is not focused on serving county residents or target populations.

Criterion 3 –Organizational Capacity for a Successful Agreement (5 points)

- Entities wanting to enter into an AAF agreement must document their financial capacity to ensure maintenance responsibilities that are part of the agreement will be fulfilled without fail.
- Entities must demonstrate effective organizational operations and must outline and agree to an effective means of meeting the minimum requirements for providing maintenance to fields to be adopted

5 Points – Entity is a long-term (more than 3 years) known entity that has provided full and complete documentation of financial capacity to enter into an agreement and has fully outlined a plan for providing comprehensive maintenance services.

4 Points – Entity is either a newer organization or a long-term provider and has provided a reasonably solid, if not comprehensive, overview of their financial capacity to enter into an agreement and has fully outlined a plan for providing comprehensive maintenance services.

3 Points - Entity is either a newer organization or a long-term provider and has provided a reasonably solid, if not comprehensive, overview of their financial capacity to enter into an agreement **and** has outlined a reasonable, if not comprehensive, plan for providing comprehensive maintenance services.

2 Points - Entity is either a newer organization or a long-term provider. While basic information is provided about financial viability, such is not sufficiently comprehensive to fully ensure raters of the capacity to enter into an agreement or the entity has not submitted an adequate plan for compliance with maintenance responsibilities.

1 Point - Entity is either a newer organization or a long-term provider. The proposal submitted provides only rudimentary information that is insufficient to determine whether the organization maintains either the capacity to successfully enter into an agreement or to provide necessary maintenance.

0 Points – The entity has submitted a proposal that is fully non-responsive in this area, such that no determination can be made about the organizations capacity to successfully enter into an agreement or the documents submitted clearly indicate the organization does not have the necessary financial attributes to execute a successful agreement.