

2015-2019 RATING CRITERIA FOR ALLOCATING RESOURCES

July 2014

Objective criteria guide the evaluation of applications for City funds to support programs to address community needs. The City is most concerned that services:

- Address the City's priorities.
- Are of high quality.
- Are financially sound.
- Participate in local/regional systems work.
- Value and incorporate equity and empowerment.

Services address the City's priorities.

1. Addresses priority needs:

To what degree does the proposed program address one or more of the strategic priority areas established by the City? Does the program meet a need that is critical to the health and welfare of individuals and the community? Is the relationship between the needs described in the application and the approach proposed clear?

Services proposed are of high quality.

2. Effective practices:

Has the applicant demonstrated that its proposed services are based in practices demonstrated in similar settings to be effective? Are the breadth and depth of services adequate to address problems effectively? What evidence is there that clients will be better off as a result of the program?

3. Outcome measures:

Does the program have systems in place to gather and assess outcome data that are meaningful at the client or system level? Is there a logical link between the services proposed and the outcome measures identified? Does the program use evaluation data to improve program services? Is the program producing results that are appropriate for its service strategy?

4. Past performance:

What is the agency's record of using and administering previously awarded funds? Have they established a pattern of responsibility in using contracted funds, including accountability in meeting contractual goals? If a new applicant, what is their record with other sources of funding? Did they provide their past funders with timely reports?

Program is financially sound.

5. Budget adequacy:

Is the budget proposed adequate to support the program as described?

6. Funding diversity:

Does the program have a variety of other sources of funds to increase the effectiveness of City funding?

7. Financial stability of the program:

Does the program demonstrate enough stability to be able to complete its contract obligations over the course of the funding period and beyond?

Services reflect City's emphasis on systems impact

8. Collaboration and partnerships:

Does the program demonstrate that it collaborates with others to share effective practices and/or develop comprehensive and interconnected service delivery approaches that maximize the potential for clients to access a full range of services to meet their unique needs?

9. Coordination of services:

How does the program coordinate with similar providers to minimize duplication of efforts?

10. Systems planning and participation:

Does the program participate in initiatives that enhance the system of service delivery in the community? To what degree does the program participate in community planning and innovation?

Accessibility and Cultural Competency

11. Accessibility of services:

Are program services convenient and accessible for the target population and for underserved populations? Does the program's hours, location, and service delivery model meet client needs and affirm the cultural backgrounds of people served?

Are service facilities accessible for persons with physical disabilities? Are appropriate translation/interpreter services readily available for persons who do not speak English fluently? Does the program reach out to and meet the needs of historically underrepresented, marginalized, or socio-economically disadvantaged populations?

12. Cultural Competency:

How is the diversity among staff, board, and volunteers of the agency reflective of the people served? What does the agency do to maintain or increase diversity? How is the agency working to increase staff and board knowledge around cultural competency and culturally responsive service-delivery models?