

**2025 Competitive Grant Process - Human Services  
Scorecard Criteria & Weight**

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



EVALUATION CRITERIA	WEIGHT	POTENTIAL POINTS	QUESTION ALIGNMENT
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALIGNMENT</b></p> <p><b>Advances the City’s Human Services Priorities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate alignment and advancement of the Human Service 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
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ACCESSIBILITY</b></p> <p><b>Demonstrates how the program is reducing systemic barriers to service</b> (policies, procedures, practices)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>	4	20	Q.5
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>INCLUSION</b></p> <p><b>Demonstrates the program’s strategic commitment to ensuring all clients feel welcomed and valued</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>IMPACT</b></p> <p><b>Measured outcomes result in consequential benefit to the clients and/or the community</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 &lt; 1year, LT is &gt; 1year)</li> </ul>	3	15	Q.7+8

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>BUDGET</b></p> <p><b>Maximizes the requested funding as an effective and efficient share of the overall program budget</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate the appropriateness of the requested funding, the clarity of the program budget, and the relative need for funding from the City</li> </ul>	2	10	Q.9-12 + budget
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CAPACITY</b></p> <p><b>Demonstrates the organization’s ability to deliver the proposed programming, steward the funds responsibly, and leverage partnerships</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate the organization’s financial health, operational stability, history of success and accountability to the City’s grant process</li> <li>Evaluate how well the program collaborates with others to achieve mutual goals</li> </ul>	2	10	Q.13-21 + 990
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>INNATE SCORE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 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. \*\*