## 2024 Competitive Grant Process - Human Services Scorecard Criteria & Weight

Fort Collins

Social
Sustainability

0-1-2-3 points per criteria assigned by each reviewer

EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHT	POTENTIAL POINTS	QUESTION ALIGNMENT
Advances the City's Human Services Priorities detailed in the Social Sustainability Strategic Plan  • Evaluate advancement of the SSD Strategic Concentrations and Priorities	5	15	Q.1-2-3
<ul> <li>Measured Outcomes Result in Consequential Benefit to the Clients and/or the Community</li> <li>Evaluate the long- and short-term impacts, the ability to gain self-sufficiency or maintain independence</li> <li>Evaluate if the measurable outcomes are relevant and related to the program</li> </ul>	5	15	Q.4
Responsive to a Documented Need or Relevant Problem in the Fort Collins Community  • Evaluate the scope of the community issue and this program's ability to address it	5	15	Q.5
<ul> <li>Extent to which the Program Serves Low-Income and Vulnerable Clients</li> <li>Evaluate the vulnerability of the population served and extent that the program serves residents below 80% AMI.</li> <li>Presumed Benefit programs recognized for fully serving very low-income clients, below 80% AMI.</li> </ul>	5	15	Q.6
<ul> <li>Advances the City's Strategic Objective Related to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion</li> <li>Evaluate the extent that the program or organization directly or indirectly advances equitable community outcomes for persons of all identities, with an emphasis on racial justice. (NLSH 1.4)</li> </ul>	5	15	Q.14+16

Maximizes the Requested Funding as an Effective and Efficient Share of the Overall Program Budget  • Evaluate the appropriateness of the requested funding, the clarity of the program budget, and the relative need for funding from the City	4	12	Q.7-11 + budget
Leverages Funding, Resources or Synergies from Other Partners  • Evaluate how well the program collaborates with others to achieve mutual goals	2	6	Q.12+13
Demonstrates the organization's ability to deliver the proposed programming and steward the funds responsibly  • Evaluate the organization's financial health, operational stability, history of success and accountability to the City's grant process	2	6	Q.17-23 + 990
<ul> <li>Innate Score</li> <li>Evaluate your internal validation &amp; importance of the program's request for funding</li> </ul>	1	3	n/a

**102** Total Points

**Board Member Favor / Disfavor for Funding:** YES NO

Board Member Proposed Funding Amount: \$\_\_\_\_\_

## **Scoring Key**

- 0 No Evidence; does not respond to the criteria at all
- 1 Below Average Strength; acceptable attainment of the criteria
- 2 Medium Strength; effective attainment of the criteria
- 3 High Strength; exceptional attainment of the criteria

<sup>\*\*</sup> Final scores submitted by the Board will be analyzed for statistical consistency and may be standardized/normalized to improve the score ranking and comparison process, if deemed appropriate by City staff. \*\*