

Scoring Guide FY 2024 _25 CDBG Application_Reviewer

Responses should meet most, but do not have to meet all, criteria to be determined to be low, medium or high quality. Sections left blank are scored 0

Section 4: About Your Program	Points Possible	Scoring Notes
Section 4: How it works, who it serves, partners, and unique qualities.		
Program Priority	1	Question is Yes/No Does the program directly enhances residents' ability to secure and maintain stable housing (e.g. eviction counseling, housing search, financial capability), or defray other costs that decrease the household income available for housing (e.g. affordable childcare, utilities programs, benefits screening,access to lower cost food outlets
Short Overview & Program Activity Description- Elevator Pitch	10	• Low quality response - neither overview or application section 8 provides a meaningful description of the content of the program (1-3 points)
		• Medium quality response - describes the need for the program, beneficiaries, and importance for Hartford (4-7 points)
		• High quality response- The program is well thought out, described clearly, and includes measurable outcomes and impact to promote positive change (8-10 points)
Program Details: target population, recruitment /outreach , demographics, planned activities, delivery/Partnerships	10	• Low quality response missing-target # outreached and enrolling is vague or missing. The % of low income participants is < 20%, Information about the program operations is missing. Program does not seem to meet the need of the community. Partnerships are lacking (1-3 points)
		• Medium quality response- Incomplete answers.Target number of participants does not sync with planned activities. The % of low income participants (owner of businesses/ residents) is < 40 %. Information about the program operations do not align with needs or capacity . Questions remain about program functions activities and operations. Partnerships exist, but their functions are not clear (4-7 points)
		• High quality response - the program components fit together, and strengthen the program. The % of low income participants (owner of businesses/ residents) is > 60%. Outreach, enrollment, program activities and partnerships are explained , make sense relative to community needs, and are are feasible and appear affective (8-10 points).
Problem Statement/ Evidence of Need	4	• Low quality response - neither problem statement or application section 8 explains the challenge, barrier or issue that the program is addressing (1 point)
		• Medium quality response- Articulated a problem, challenge, barrier or issue, but did not provide support with recent or reputable supporting information, or it is unclear that the problem impacts the target beneficiary population. (2-3 points)
		• High quality response- Clearly articulates a problem, challenge, barrier, or issues facing the target beneficiary population using data from reputable/verifiable sources. (4 points)
Best Practices and Success Stories	6	• Low quality response-Does not have best practices, a success story or an aspect of the program that sets it apart from others and does not provide justification in Section 8. (1-2 points)
		•Medium quality response- inadequately supports the claim of best practices, or unique qualities ; or displays unfamiliarity with similar programs (3-4 points)
		• High quality response- Clearly identifies and documents their best practice or unique services that sets itself apart from other programs and provides an example of how the program is critical to the community and the City. (5-6 points)
Total Points	31	

Scoring Guide FY 2024 _25 CDBG Application_Reviewer

Section 5: Organizational Capacity		Points Possible	Scoring Notes
Section 5 seeks to evaluate the abilities of the organization's staff to lead, manage and implement the program			
Staff Qualifications	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- <u>Program Lead</u> has been with the organization for <1 year or has limited relevant experience, education or expertise in the program area. <u>Front Line staff</u> has limited relevant experience, education or expertise in the program area; and No information about how staff experience helps program beneficiaries succeed. No full or part-time financial staff. (1-4 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- <u>Program Lead</u> has been with the organization from 1-3 years or has a moderate level of relevant experience, education or expertise in the program area. <u>Front Line staff</u> has some relevant experience, education or expertise in the program area; and moderate explanation why staff do a good job working with program beneficiaries. Only part-time financial staff (5-10 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response - <u>Program Lead</u> has been with the organization for > 3 years or has strong relevant experience, education or expertise in the program area. <u>Front Line staff</u> has strong relevant experience, education or expertise in the program area; and there is a statement explaining how staff are well qualified to work with program beneficiaries. Organization has full time financial staff. (11-15 points) 	
Other Organizational Capacity :	4	<i>Criteria: 1) employee manual, 2) HR admin, 3) professional development training, 4) compliance with Fed regs 5) accounting manual 6) acctng software 7) Fed fund administration experience</i>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- < 2 of the named criteria above in place (1 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- < 4 (half of the named criteria above are in place (2-3 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response- 5 or more of the criteria named above are in place (4 points) 	
Total Points	19		
Section 6: Measuring Results		Points Possible	Scoring Notes
Section 6 I: how the organization evaluates program results using information from prior years. Looks for outcomes in addition to # served, and for the relevance of these metrics to the program goal.			
History of Funding	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Provides no more than 1 year of performance measurement information. (1-3 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- Provides 2 or more years of performance measurement information. (4-7 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response Provides 3 years of performance measurement information. (8-10 points) 	
Metrics	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Identifies at least one result metric, but does not demonstrate the ability to measure, track, quantify and report outcomes related to that metric; or does not identify a metric except number served. (1-3 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- Identifies at least one result metric other than number served, and clearly demonstrates the ability to measure, track, quantify and report outcomes related to that metric. (4-7 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response - More than 1 result metric. Clearly demonstrates the ability to measure, track, and report outcomes related to that metric; (8-10 points) 	
Outcomes	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Metric not related to the problem identified. Little or no history of positive outcomes, failure to serve a significant # of clients, (1-3 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- Metric collected clearly relates to the problem identified Measured results demonstrate generally positive outcomes. (4-7 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response -Metric collected clearly relate to the problem identified. Measured results demonstrate exemplary positive outcomes (8-10 points) 	
Total Points	30		

Scoring Guide FY 2024 _25 CDBG Application_Reviewer

Section 7: Program Request and Budget		Points Possible	Scoring Notes
Section 7: assessment of organization’s line-by-line budget for the program for which they are requesting CDBG funds.			
Program Funding Sources	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- CDBG request is for more than 75 percent of total funding. No portion of the program budget has been secured. (1-2 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- CDBG request is for 35 to 75% of total funding. Some of the program budget has been secured (3-4 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response CDBG request is for no more than 35% of total funding. Significant portion of program budget is already secured. (5-6 points) 	
Other Funding Sources	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Program budget lists other grants/donations, program income or other funding sources, but does not describe them_ (1 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response - Program budget list and describes other grants/donations, program income or other funding sources (2 points) 	
CDBG Request (Line Item Budget)	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Budget is missing or does not provide justification (1 point) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- Provides expense categories, but includes ineligible expenses or lacks clarity or linkage to program or has seemingly duplicative expense categories, e.g., supplies and materials. (2 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response -Lists up to 5 clear and distinct expense categories with accompanying request amount that make sense (3 points) 	
Budget Narrative	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Narrative does not state how cost was determined or describe how the expense category will be used in the program (1-2 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- Narrative is not clear how cost was determined, e.g., for payroll, not specific as to hourly wage or hours worked; and does not describe how the expenses are critical to program success (3-4 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response -Narrative clearly describes how cost was determined, e.g., for payroll, listing hourly wage, fringe rate and hours worked; and shows that each expense is critical to program expense (5 -6 points) 	
Sustainability and Funding Impact	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low quality response- Suggests long term reliance on CDBG funds or demonstrates unfamiliarity with or inability to secure other funds. Organization simply suggests that it has no capacity to offer or continue activity without CDBG funding. Does not articulate why this would be the case (1 point) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium quality response- Describes a desire to reduce reliance on CDBG funds, but doesn’t identify other funding sources. Describes how the loss of CDBG funds will impact the program, by referencing specific changes in staffing levels, number of clients served or other outcome measures. Suggested impacts appear out of line with overall budget. (2 points) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality response -Describes long term strategy to reduce reliance of CDBG funds, e.g. identifies other sustainable funding sources. Organization clearly describes how the loss of CDBG funds will impact the program, by referencing specific changes in staffing levels, number of clients served or other outcome measures. Suggested impacts appear in line with overall budget. (3 points) 	
Total Points	10		