## 2025 Competitive Grant Process - Homelessness Response Scorecard Criteria & Weight & Prevention



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

		POTENTIAL	QUESTION
<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	WEIGHT	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>ALIGNMENT</b>
<ul> <li>ALIGNMENT</li> <li>Advances the City's Homelessness Priorities</li> <li>Evaluate alignment and advancement of the Homelessness Priority the applicant selected</li> <li>Evaluate the significance of the data presented by the applicant to demonstrate the need for their programming at the local level (Fort Collins specific)</li> </ul>	4	20	Q.1-2
ACCESSIBILITY  Demonstrates how the program is reducing systemic barriers to service (policies, procedures, practices)  • 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
<ul> <li>INCLUSION</li> <li>Demonstrates the program's strategic commitment to ensuring all clients feel welcomed and valued</li> <li>Evaluate the extent that the program creates supportive client experiences, provides accommodations for participation, and integrates a diversity of client perspectives</li> </ul>	4	20	Q.6
IMPACT  Measured outcomes result in consequential benefit to the clients and/or the community  • 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

BUDGET  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	2	10	Q.9-12 + budget
CAPACITY  Demonstrates the organization's ability to deliver the proposed programming, steward the funds responsibly, and leverage partnerships  • 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.13-21 + 990
<ul> <li>INNATE SCORE</li> <li>Evaluate your internal validation &amp; importance of the program's request for funding</li> </ul>	1	5	n/a

**100** Total Points

Board Member Favor / Disfavor for F	unding:	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

<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. \*\*