

# FY26 Purchase of Services Grants Scoring Rubric

Each section contains detail on determining proper scores, as some sections contain fewer than 5 points, so be mindful of this as you are reviewing. In general, scoring criteria is on a scale of:

**5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Acceptable, 2 = Poor, and 1 = Very Poor**

## Eligibility (Total Points: 3)

2 Points for New service OR

1 Point for Expansion of existing service OR

0 Points for neither new nor expanded service AND

1 Point for Organizations that have not received Purchase of Service funds in the last 4 years.

## Narrative (Total Points: 10)

### Project Description (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for projects that clearly and explicitly align with specific City Council Goals and Priorities. The description includes clear explanation of how the project will contribute towards CC Goals/Priorities.

4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for projects that identify a City Council Goal and Priority. Gives some detail, but the link is not immediately explicit how the program will advance these efforts.

2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for projects that are not explicit in their link to City Council Goals or Priorities.

### Need Justification (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for projects that clearly and explicitly describe the need for their proposed programming in the community. Baseline data is provided to justify the need, and it is clearly described how the program will address the need identified.

4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for projects that identify a need and describe how their program will address the need.

2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for projects that do not clearly identify a need that will be addressed in the community, nor how their program will address the need. The purpose of the program is unclear or unjustified.

## Intercultural Competency, Belonging, and Economic Mobility (Total Points: 15)

### Intercultural Competency Value (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for applicants that clearly and explicitly state how their organization values the advancement of intercultural competency in the community. Their answers show that they have a deep understanding and commitment to intercultural competency and are taking proactive steps towards contributing to this outcome.

### 4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for applicants that have participated in some understanding of advancing intercultural competency in the community and can cite relevant ways in which their organization is contributing to intercultural competency. Their answer shows that they have an understanding of how their current programs contribute to intercultural competency, but it is not clear that it is prioritized in their organization.

### 2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for applicants that do not describe how their organization values or prioritizes intercultural competency, or their proposed program does not contribute to intercultural competency.

### Belonging (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for applicants that clearly and explicitly state how their organization values the advancement of belonging in the community. Their answers show that they have a deep understanding and commitment to belonging and are taking proactive steps towards contributing to this outcome.

### 4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for applicants that have participated in some understanding of advancing belonging in the community and can cite relevant ways in which their organization is contributing to belonging. Their answer shows that they have an understanding of how their current programs contribute to belonging, but it is not clear that it is prioritized in their organization.

### 2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for applicants that do not describe how their organization values or prioritizes belonging, or their proposed program does not contribute to belonging.

### Economic Mobility (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for applicants that clearly and explicitly state how their organization values the advancement of economic mobility in the community. Their answers show that they have a deep understanding and commitment to economic mobility and are taking proactive steps towards contributing to this outcome.

### 4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for applicants that have participated in some understanding of advancing economic mobility in the community and can cite relevant ways in which their organization is

contributing to economic mobility. Their answer shows that they have an understanding of how their current programs contribute to economic mobility, but it is not clear that it is prioritized in their organization.

#### 2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for applicants that do not describe how their organization values or prioritizes economic mobility, or their proposed program does not contribute to economic mobility.

### Outcomes (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for projects that clearly and explicitly describe the anticipated impact of their proposed programming, and how they will measure this impact. They are descriptive in how they will collect data (quantitative and/or qualitative) on outputs and outcomes. The data they are collecting and the impact is congruent with the need identified in the project description part of the narrative.

#### 4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for projects that identify with some detail how the project will make a general impact in the community. A general description of data collection is provided and makes sense that it could be related to the need identified in the project description part of the narrative.

#### 2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for projects that do not clearly identify an impact in the community. Data collection is not realistic or congruent to the identified need.

### Budget (Total Points: 7)

#### Budget Worksheet (Points: 2)

2 Points for budgets that use the Budget Worksheet provided and request funding within the guidelines (\$15,000 - \$25,000 total request; no more than 75% of the total project cost). Budget request aligns with the described program and costs are justified based on the narrative.

1 Points for budgets that use the Budget Worksheet provided and request funding within the guidelines (\$15,000 - \$25,000 total request; no more than 75% of the total project cost). Budget request does not appear to be congruent to the program described; costs do not appear to be justified or are unclear.

0 Point for budgets that do not use the Budget Worksheet provided or are not within the funding guidelines (\$15,000 - \$25,000 total request; no more than 75% of the total project cost).

#### Budget Narrative (Points: 5)

5 Points (Excellent) for applicants that exemplify organizational capacity to run the proposed program and financial management. Budget request is clearly explained; you can easily tell what the funding will be used for and it is congruent with the funding request. High confidence that the program will be successful and that this is a responsible allocation of funding.

#### 4 Points (Good)

3 Points (Acceptable) for applicants that give general detail on the budget and organizational capacity for program delivery and financial management. Moderate confidence that the program will be successful and that this is likely a responsible allocation of funding.

2 Points (Poor)

1 Point (Very Poor) for applicants that do not offer an explanation on the budget or their organization's experience with program delivery and financial management. Low confidence that this program will be successful; this is not a responsible allocation of funding.