

**CITY OF DUBLIN
HUMAN SERVICES GRANT RATING SHEET**

Organization: _____

Program: _____

City Staff Section

Organization/Management (1 point each, maximum of 5)

| | |
|--|--|
| The organization previously received funding from Dublin and has fully complied with the City's management procedures, including invoice and report deadlines. | |
| The organization, as presented in the application, is able to achieve the stated goals and outcomes. | |
| The organization and its staff are qualified and have the capacity to provide for the program. (non-profit status, resumes for staff, Board of Directors, information on clients served) | |
| The organization has completed all required aspects of the application process. | |
| The proposed program has a successful proven track record (not a new program). | |
| Total Points: | |
| The estimated total number of unduplicated Dublin Residents to be served: | |
| Qualifies for: <input type="checkbox"/> CDBG <input type="checkbox"/> General Fund <input type="checkbox"/> ARPA <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

Commission Member Section

Need – Rate the need for this program/service.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|--|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The applicant does not articulate a clear need for the project in their application and is unlikely to address that need. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The applicant identifies a clear need, but it is not a critical human service need, and/or the applicant does not demonstrate a high likelihood of addressing that need. | |
| High 6-10 | The applicant identifies a critical human service need in Dublin that other organizations do not and demonstrates a high likelihood of addressing that need. | |
| Comments: | | |

Benefit – Rate the benefit to low-income or high-risk individuals/households in Dublin.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|------------|---|-------|
| Low 0-2 | Applicant demonstrates a low number of low-income or high-risk Dublin individuals/households who will benefit from the project, and the application fails to identify any outcomes or ways it will measure project success. | |

| | | |
|--------------|--|--|
| Mid 3-5 | Applicant demonstrates a moderate number of low-income or high-risk Dublin individuals/households who will benefit from the project. The application identifies outcomes but is unclear or unlikely to demonstrate a project impact. | |
| High 6-10 | Applicant demonstrates a high number of low-income or high-risk Dublin individuals/households who will benefit from the project. The application identifies clear and measurable outcomes to demonstrate project impact. | |
| Comments: | | |

Funding – Rate the applicant’s funding request.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|---|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The funding request is unreasonably high given the project's proposed impact, and the number of people served; the project budget is unrealistic. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The funding request is reasonable but does not demonstrate a high impact or cost effectiveness given the proposed number of people served and/or the project budget has significant questions or flaws. | |
| High 6-10 | The funding request is a reasonable amount demonstrating high impact and cost effectiveness given the proposed number of people served; the project budget is feasible and sound. | |
| Comments: | | |

Funding Sustainability – Rate the diversification of the project’s funding sources.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|--|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The Grant request is the only source of funds for the applicant’s proposed project. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The applicant has identified more than one funding source to support the proposed activity/service, but this grant request would be the main source of funds, and the long-term sustainability of the project is questionable. | |
| High 6-10 | The applicant has identified multiple funding sources to support the proposed activity/service and ensure sustainability. The organization produces other income that may be used to support this program (fundraising). | |
| Comments: | | |

City Funding – Rate the necessity of City funding for this project.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|--|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The project is not appropriate for City funds and will not reduce demands on other City resources. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The project is an appropriate use for City funds but will not reduce demands on other City resources and/or other types of funding sources would be a better fit for this project. | |
| High 6-10 | City funds are critical to the project, and funding request is appropriate for City sources and reduces demands for other City resources. | |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Comments: | |
|-----------|--|

Consistency with Policies – Rate the proposal’s consistency with the HUD Strategic Goals and HUD Policy Priorities. (To determine CDBG eligibility)

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|--|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The proposal does not address any of the HUD Strategic Goals or HUD Policy Priorities. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The proposal addresses one of the HUD Strategic Goals or HUD Policy Priorities. | |
| High 6-10 | The proposal helps address multiple HUD Strategic Goals or HUD Policy Priorities. | |
| Comments: | | |

City Council Priorities – Rate the extent the proposal addresses one or more of the City Council’s priorities.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|--|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The proposal does not address any of the Council’s priorities. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The proposal addresses one or two of the Council’s priorities but does not have a high likelihood of doing so effectively. | |
| High 6-10 | The proposal demonstrates a high likelihood of addressing multiple Council priorities. | |
| Comments: | | |

Alameda County 14 Areas of Concerns – Rate the extent the proposal addresses one or more of the 14 areas of concern as identified by the Alameda County Needs Assessment Report.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|---|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The proposal does not address any of the 14 areas of concern. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The proposal addresses one or two of the 14 areas of concern but does not have a high likelihood of doing so effectively. | |
| High 6-10 | The proposal is highly likely to address multiple areas of the 14 areas of concern. | |
| Comments: | | |

Innovation – If funds were allocated last year for the same project/activity, rate the extent to which the applicant adequately responds to changing community conditions. If the proposal is for a new project, rate the extent to which the project uses a new and innovative approach to solve an identified problem.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------|-------------|-------|
|--------|-------------|-------|

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| Low 0-2 | The applicant does not demonstrate an ability to adapt the project to changing needs or is not using an innovative approach. | |
| Mid 3-5 | It is unclear how the project will respond to changing community conditions identified in the application or use an effective but not particularly innovative approach. | |
| High 6-10 | The applicant demonstrates a high likelihood of responding to changing conditions and/or using an innovative approach. | |
| Comments: | | |

Access – Rate the extent to which the project will ensure non-English speakers, people with disabilities, people experiencing homelessness, seniors, low-income families, and/or youth can access the proposed program or activities.

| Rating | Description | Score |
|--------------|--|-------|
| Low 0-2 | The proposal does not mention accessibility concerns and does not describe how it will remove barriers or help community members access its services. | |
| Mid 3-5 | The proposal addresses accessibility concerns but does not identify concrete or impactful ways the project will remove barriers for priority populations. | |
| High 6-10 | The proposal describes concrete and impactful ways the applicant will improve language, technology, and/or transportation access for priority populations. | |
| Comments: | | |

| | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Proposal Total Score: | | |
| Recommend Funding: | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Total Requested: | | Total Recommended: |

Commissioner Name

Date

Suggested determination of allocation amount:

| Points | Percent Qualifies For |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| 80+ Points | 80-100% of request |
| 60-79 Points | 50-80% of request |
| 59 and below | 0-50% of request |