

Score Summary

Case Id: 11382
Name: NBLY TEST

Reviewer: Dale Hale

Score

0 out of 20

Status: Active

Last updated: 11/19/2025 2:22:02 PM

SECTION	POINTS AWARDED	AVAILABLE POINTS
Scoring. Criteria: Strong (2) Satisfactory (1) Unsatisfactory (0)	0	0
A. EXPERIENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY	0	6
B. COMMUNITY NEED AND IMPACT	0	10
C. FINANCIAL CAPACITY	0	4
Total	0	20

Reviewer Notes:

Score Report

Case Id: 11382

Name: NBLY TEST

Reviewer: Dale Hale

SCORING: CRITERIA: STRONG (2) SATISFACTORY (1) UNSATISFACTORY (0)	POINTS AWARDED	AVAILABLE POINTS
	N/A	N/A
Section Total	0	0

A: EXPERIENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY	POINTS AWARDED	AVAILABLE POINTS
Experience in managing the proposed program (F.2) Strong (2) – The organization has strong, relevant experience and capacity to effectively manage and deliver the proposed program, supported by clear examples or past performance. Satisfactory (1) – The organization has some relevant experience and capacity to manage the proposed program, though details may be limited . Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization demonstrates limited or no relevant experience or capacity to manage the proposed program.	0	2
Documented grant management experience (F.1) Strong (2) - The organization clearly describes and demonstrates substantial experience managing grants, including compliance, reporting, and fiscal oversight. Satisfactory (1) – The organization describes experience managing grants, but the explanation lacks detail or depth. Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization does not demonstrate experience managing grants or provides insufficient information.	0	2
Client feedback and program improvement. (C.13 and D.2)	0	2

Strong (2) – The organization demonstrates a clear history of collecting client feedback and using it to inform and implement meaningful program improvements. Satisfactory (1) – The organization provides a clear plan to collect client feedback and use it to improve programs, but lacks demonstrated experience. Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization does not demonstrate experience collecting client feedback and does not provide a clear plan to use feedback for program improvement.		
Section Total	0	6

B: COMMUNITY NEED AND IMPACT	POINTS AWARDED	AVAILABLE POINTS
Program description and implementation plan (C.2) Strong (2) – The organization provides a clear, detailed, and cohesive description of the program, including specific implementation steps, timelines, and how the program will be delivered to participants. Satisfactory (1) – The organization provides a general description of the program and its implementation, but some details may be vague or incomplete. Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization does not provide a clear description of the program or its implementation, or the information is missing or insufficient.	0	2
Community need and impact. (B.3a and B.3b) Strong (2) - The organization provides a clear, compelling description of the community need, supported by relevant data or context, and articulates a strong connection between the program and its anticipated impact on the community. Satisfactory (1) - The organization describes the community need and expected impact, but the explanation may lack detail, specificity, or supporting context. Unsatisfactory (0) - The organization does not clearly define the community need or the anticipated impact on the community.	0	2
Community Collaboration and Coordination (C.7)	0	2

Strong (2) – The organization provides a clear and detailed description of active engagement with community partners. The response demonstrates intentional coordination to avoid duplication of services and leverage existing resources. Satisfactory (1) – The organization describes engagement with community partners, but the explanation lacks detail or does not clearly show how duplication of services is avoided. Unsatisfactory (0) - The organization does not describe engagement with community partners or provide information on efforts to avoid duplication of services.		
Outcome selection and definition (C.12) Strong (2) – The organization selected at least one common outcome (and no more than four total), and clearly defined any unique outcomes tailored to the program. The outcomes are specific, measurable, and aligned with program goals. Satisfactory (1) – The organization selected at least one common outcome and defined unique outcomes, if applicable, but the outcomes may lack clarity or specificity. Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization did not select at least one common outcome or failed to clearly define unique outcomes.	0	2
Use of funds and program alignment (C.8-C.10) Strong (2) – The organization clearly outlines how requested funds will be used (e.g., staff salary, service fees, rental assistance, etc.) and provides a strong justification for each expense. Staff positions funded through the grant are clearly described and directly tied to serving program participants. Satisfactory (1) – The organization identifies how requested funds will be used and provides a general justification. Staff roles funded through the grant are mentioned but may lack detail on how they directly serve participants. Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization does not clearly explain how funds will be used or how funded staff positions relate to direct service of program participants.	0	2
Section Total	0	10

C: FINANCIAL CAPACITY	POINTS AWARDED	AVAILABLE POINTS
Program Continuation Plan (C.11) Strong (2) – The organization provided a clear and realistic plan to continue the program with partial, or no City grant funds and identifies alternative funding sources or strategies to sustain the program. Satisfactory (1) – The organization provides a general plan to continue the program with partial, or no City grant funds but does not identify alternative funding sources or sustainability strategies. Unsatisfactory (0) – The organization does not have a plan to continue the program with partial, or no City grant funds.	0	2
Funding Diversification and Financial Sustainability (Section E – Revenue & Expenses) Strong (2)– The submitted Revenue & Expenses sheet demonstrates a diversified portfolio of revenue sources for the proposed activity AND the organization, indicating strong financial sustainability. Satisfactory (1) - The submitted Revenue & Expenses sheet is complete but show limited diversification of revenue sources for the proposed activity AND/OR organization. Unsatisfactory (0) – The submitted Revenue & Expenses sheet is incomplete or missing.	0	2
Section Total	0	4