

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE:** Individual ratings will be averaged to achieve the activity's FINAL score.

City of St. Louis – Community Development Administration

2015 CDBG Proposal Rating Sheet

Applicant Organization: \_\_\_\_\_ Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Activity Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Rater Number: \_\_\_\_\_ **TOTAL SCORE:** \_\_\_\_\_

Instructions: Rate each activity based on the following criteria. Please place the total rating/score above.

<b>Priorities:</b> Does the activity meet the priorities identified on pages 6 and 7 of the RFP?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>
	Indirectly meets a Plan priority.				Directly meets a Plan priority.					

<b>Needs:</b> Does the activity design demonstrate a positive impact on community need?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>
	Unclear design, unclear impact.			Design clear, impact on need is marginal			Design clear with direct and lasting impact on need.					

<b>Outcomes:</b> To what extent are proposed activity outcomes realistic and measurable?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>
	Objectives are ill-defined, or unachievable within time frame.						Objectives are stated, but fuzzy, or unrealistic.					Objectives are clear, measurable, with evaluation in place.					

<b>Fiscal Logic:</b> Does the activity demonstrate appropriate budget, cost/unit, and cost control?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	
	Proposed budget is far too low or far too high to cover proposed program.							Budget is not clear or well-defined, but appropriate.					Budget clear, well-defined, leverages other funds.						

<b>Collaboration:</b> Does this activity demonstrate agency success in securing other resources or inter-agency cooperation?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>
	Demonstrates little cooperation with other agencies.				Demonstrates cooperation in one area of operation			Shows cooperation across spectrum of functions and in-kind support			

<b>Agency Program Qualifications:</b> Does the organization have sufficient staff capacity and have staff members been successful in implementing similar activities?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
	Low in-house capacity, poor track record, and poor service.				Some experience, erratic service; hit or miss track record.				Experienced in providing service, but hit or miss track record.				High quality service, strong administration, and excellent track record.			

<b>Agency Financial Qualifications:</b> Does the organization have sound financial management systems in place?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>
	Poor financial systems, recent unresolved audit findings.				Adequate financial systems; audit findings resolved.							Excellent financial systems; no audit findings.				

<b>BONUS POINTS Sustainability:</b> Does this activity address the Sustainability Plan or the Sustainability Action Agenda?	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
	Addresses Sustainability Plan and/or Mayor's Action Agenda				