

**2025 Competitive Grant Process - CDBG Public Service
Scorecard Criteria & Weight**

0-1-2-3-4-5 points per criteria assigned by each reviewer



EVALUATION CRITERIA	POTENTIAL WEIGHT	POINTS	QUESTION ALIGNMENT
<p style="text-align: center;">ALIGNMENT</p> <p>Advances the City’s Consolidate Plan Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate alignment and advancement of the Consolidated Plan Goal the applicant selected Evaluate the significance of the data presented by the applicant to demonstrate the need for their programming at the local level (Fort Collins specific) 	4	20	Q.1-2
<p style="text-align: center;">ACCESSIBILITY</p> <p>Demonstrates how the program is reducing systemic barriers to service (policies, procedures, practices)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the extent to which the program is designed to encourage equitable participation and targets outreach efforts to residents that are least likely to access services 	4	20	Q.5
<p style="text-align: center;">INCLUSION</p> <p>Demonstrates the program’s strategic commitment to ensuring all clients feel welcomed and valued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the extent that the program creates supportive client experiences, provides accommodations for participation, and integrates a diversity of client perspectives 	4	20	Q.6
<p style="text-align: center;">IMPACT</p> <p>Measured outcomes result in consequential benefit to the clients and/or the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the short- and long-term impacts that the program is intended to have towards stabilizing and/or improving the socioeconomic conditions and overall well-being of the residents receiving services (ST is < 1year, LT is > 1year) 	3	15	Q.7+8

<p style="text-align: center;">BUDGET</p> <p>Maximizes the requested funding as an effective and efficient share of the overall program budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the appropriateness of the requested funding, the clarity of the program budget, and the relative need for funding from the City 	2	10	Q.9-12 + budget
<p style="text-align: center;">CAPACITY</p> <p>Demonstrates the organization’s ability to deliver the proposed programming, steward the funds responsibly, and leverage partnerships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the organization’s financial health, operational stability, history of success and accountability to the City’s grant process Evaluate how well the program collaborates with others to achieve mutual goals 	2	10	Q.13-20 + 990
<p style="text-align: center;">INNATE SCORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate your internal validation & importance of the program’s request for funding 	1	5	n/a

100 Total Points

Board Member Favor / Disfavor for Funding: YES NO

Budget Items Not Supported, if any _____

Scoring Key

- 0 – No Evidence; does not respond to the criteria at all
- 1 – Low Strength; unsatisfactory attainment of the criteria
- 2 – Insufficient Strength; weak attainment of the criteria
- 3 – Adequate Strength; average attainment of the criteria
- 4 – Above Average Strength; effective attainment of the criteria
- 5 – Excellent Strength; exceptional attainment of the criteria

** 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. **