Scoring Criteria

FY27/28 Funding Cycle

Citizens' Benefit Fund Grant

Grant Threshold Requirements

Applications will only be considered if:

- Applicant has submitted all required application documents by the application deadline.
- Applicant has submitted required annual report(s) for funding received for the FY25/26 Citizens' Benefit Fund (CBF) grant.

Grant Application Scoring Rubric	Total Points
1. Organizational Capacity & Collaboration (Application Questions 13 & 17)	10
2. Community Need & Social Determinants of Health (Application Question 14)	15
3. Population & Roseville Impact (Application Question 15)	15
4. Proposed Approach & Evidence (Application Question 16)	15
5. Strategic Alignment & Community Value (Application Question 19)	10
6. Outcomes & Measurement (Application Question 20)	15
7. Budget & Cost Effectiveness (Application Question 21)	10
8. Sustainability & Leveraging Other Resources (Application Questions 22 & 23)	10
TOTAL POINTS	100

Scoring Rubric & Definitions

The scoring rubric is intended to evaluate the quality and likely impact of the proposed project, not simply the size of the organization or the number of people served. A higher number of residents served should not automatically result in a higher score. Likewise, a project serving fewer residents should not automatically receive a lower score when the intervention is more intensive, addresses greater barriers, or is expected to produce a more significant outcome.

Reviewers should evaluate applicants based on evidence appropriate to the nature of the proposed project. Quantitative data is valuable where available, but credible qualitative evidence, participant experience, organizational results, community knowledge, and other appropriate forms of evidence may also be relevant. Scores should reflect the information contained in the current application and supporting materials only and not past history or past applications. Reviewers should not seek information that the application does not ask applicants to provide.

Previous GAC funding should provide context regarding continuation, expansion, or change from prior awards and should not, by itself, increase or decrease a competitive score. The partial funding question should provide the GAC with information to consider when determining award amounts, including the consequences of different funding levels. For other application questions not reflected in the Scoring Rubric as aligning with a point value, those are non-scored but important required informational questions.

Capital expenditure questions should remain subject to applicable administrative, eligibility, ownership, and bid requirements.

1) Organizational Capacity & Collaboration — 10 Points Total (5pts each question)
Application Questions 13 & 17

Reviewers should evaluate whether the organization demonstrates the capacity, staffing, resources, and community partnerships necessary to successfully implement the proposed project. Reviewers should consider the roles, responsibilities, training and supervision, and project-related contributions of identified paid staff and/or volunteers, as well as the relevance and value of community partnerships (leveraging resources rather than duplication).

The number of staff or volunteers should not determine the score. Organizations should be evaluated based on whether the identified staffing structure, available resources, and community partnerships are appropriate to the scope and complexity of the proposed project and contribute to meaningful outcomes for Roseville residents.

5 | Strong
Clearly demonstrates that the organization has the capacity and resources necessary to implement the proposed project. Volunteer roles, when applicable, are clearly defined and appropriate to the project. Community partners have meaningful and clearly defined roles, with evidence that collaboration, referrals, or service coordination will improve access, efficiency, or outcomes for Roseville residents.

4 | Good
Demonstrates adequate organizational and implementation capacity. Staff and volunteer roles are relevant to the proposed project and generally well defined, with appropriate training or supervision identified. The application provides a reasonable explanation of how staffing will support project implementation and outcomes for Roseville residents. Partnerships and referral or coordination relationships are relevant to the proposed project and provide reasonable added value.

3 | Adequate
Provides some evidence of organizational capacity and collaboration but leaves questions regarding the organization's ability to fully implement the proposed project. Staff or volunteer roles, responsibilities, training, or supervision may be limited or insufficiently defined, or their contribution to project outcomes is not clearly established. Partner roles or collaboration benefits may also be limited or insufficiently defined.

1–2 | Weak
Provides limited evidence of the organizational capacity, staffing, resources, or partnerships necessary to implement the proposed project. Staff or volunteer roles and responsibilities, training or supervision, or their contribution to outcomes for Roseville residents are unclear or insufficiently connected to the proposed project. Partner roles or collaboration benefits are also unclear.

0 | Insufficient
Does not demonstrate adequate organizational capacity, staffing, resources, or meaningful collaboration necessary to implement the proposed project.

2) Community Need & Social Determinants of Health — 15 Points
Application Question 14

Reviewers should evaluate whether the applicant establishes a specific need, barrier, or service gap affecting Roseville residents and demonstrates how the selected Social Determinant(s) of Health relate to that need and proposed project. Roseville-specific evidence should be considered when available. When Roseville-specific data is unavailable, reviewers should consider whether the applicant reasonably explains how the geographic area, population, research, or other evidence relates to Roseville. The quality, relevance, credibility, and Roseville applicability of the evidence should be considered rather than simply the quantity of data provided.

13–15 | Strong
Clearly identifies a specific and significant need, barrier, or service gap affecting Roseville residents. Clearly explains how the selected SDOH contributes to or relates to the identified need. Provides relevant, credible evidence demonstrating that the need exists and affects Roseville residents, preferably using Roseville-specific data. Establishes a strong connection between the identified need, SDOH, and proposed project.

10–12 | Good
Clearly identifies a need affecting Roseville residents and explains its relationship to the selected SDOH. Provides credible supporting evidence and establishes a reasonable connection between the identified need and proposed project.

6–9 | Adequate
Identifies a community need and references an applicable SDOH, but evidence is limited, generalized, outdated, or primarily anecdotal. The relationship between the SDOH, identified need, and proposed project is only partially established.

1–5 | Weak
Need is vague, primarily describes an organizational need, or lacks credible supporting evidence. Limited connection is established between the SDOH, the need, and Roseville residents.

0 | Insufficient
Does not establish a relevant community need, barrier, or service gap affecting Roseville residents.

3) Population & Roseville Impact — 15 Points

Application Question 15

Reviewers should evaluate whether the applicant clearly identifies the Roseville residents who will be served and demonstrates that the proposed project addresses a meaningful need, gap, or access issue for that population. The number of residents served should be considered in context. Higher volume alone does not constitute greater community impact. Consider the intensity, duration, complexity, barriers addressed, and anticipated benefit of the proposed project.

13–15 | Strong
Clearly identifies the target Roseville population and provides specific, credible information regarding the estimated number served, demographic characteristics, key characteristics or barriers, and relationship to the identified need. Clearly explains how residents will access or be referred to the program and how Roseville residency will be verified. Demonstrates with evidence how the proposed project complements, expands, fills a gap in, or differs from similar services in Roseville and why the project remains needed.

10–12 | Good
Clearly identifies the population and estimated number served. Provides reasonable information regarding demographics, barriers, access, residency verification, and the relationship to existing services. Provides a reasonable explanation of why the proposed project is needed.

6–9 | Adequate
Identifies the population and number expected to be served, but information is primarily descriptive. Provides limited evidence regarding population characteristics, access, residency verification, service gaps, or differentiation from similar services.

1–5 | Weak
Population is broadly or vaguely defined. Limited information is provided about barriers, access, Roseville residency, or the relationship between the project and existing services.

0 | Insufficient
Does not adequately identify who will benefit or demonstrate relevant impact on Roseville residents.

4) Proposed Approach & Evidence — 15 Points

Application Question 16

Reviewers should evaluate whether the proposed services, activities, or interventions are clearly defined, responsive to the identified need and population, and supported by appropriate evidence. Applicants do not need to cite formal academic

research. Depending on the nature of the project, relevant organizational experience, participant results, proven or promising practices, community experience, and other credible evidence may appropriately support the proposed approach.

13–15 | Strong
Clearly describes specific services, activities, or interventions and establishes a strong connection to the need identified in Question 15 and population identified in Question 16. Clearly explains why the approach is appropriate for the population. Provides strong supporting evidence through research, proven or promising practices, prior program results, participant data, or relevant community experience. Clearly explains how the project complements, expands, fills a gap in, or differs from similar services and how duplication will be avoided.

10–12 | Good
Clearly describes the proposed approach and connects it to the identified need and population. Provides reasonable evidence supporting the approach and explains its appropriateness. Addresses the relationship to similar services.

6–9 | Adequate
Describes proposed activities but provides limited evidence supporting the approach or limited explanation of why it is appropriate for the identified population. Relationship to existing services may be unclear.

1–5 | Weak
Activities are described generally or are not clearly connected to the identified need, population, or existing service landscape. Limited evidence supports the proposed approach.

0 | Insufficient
Does not provide a clear or credible approach for addressing the identified need.

5) Strategic Alignment & Community Value — 10 Points

Application Question 19

Reviewers should evaluate whether the applicant explains the specific connection between the proposed activities, selected City priority, and expected benefit to Roseville residents. Applicants should explain the specific connection between the project and priority rather than restating the City's strategic priorities.

9–10 | Strong
Clearly identifies and explains the specific connection between the proposed activities and selected City priority. Clearly articulates the expected benefit to Roseville residents and demonstrates meaningful community value.

7–8 | Good
Provides a clear and reasonable connection between the proposed project and selected City priority. Describes a meaningful expected benefit to Roseville residents.

4–6 | Adequate
Identifies a City priority but provides limited explanation of how the proposed activities advance it or how the project benefits Roseville residents.

1–3 | Weak
Provides a general or superficial connection to the selected City priority with limited explanation of specific community benefit.

0 | Insufficient
Does not demonstrate a meaningful connection between the proposed project, selected City priority, and benefit to Roseville residents.

6) Outcomes & Measurement — 15 Points

Application Question 20

Reviewers should evaluate whether the applicant identifies meaningful outcomes, measurable objectives, and an appropriate process for measuring progress and success. Number of residents served may be an appropriate output or measure for some projects but should not automatically be treated as an outcome. Reviewers should consider whether the proposed measures appropriately reflect the actual purpose and expected benefit of the project. The measures should be appropriate to the nature, intensity, duration, and intended outcomes of the proposed project.

13–15 | Strong
Clearly identifies meaningful project outcomes, specific goals, and measurable objectives with realistic targets. Identifies appropriate data and tools to track progress and results. Measures demonstrate what the project is expected to accomplish or change for Roseville residents rather than relying solely on activity counts. Provides sufficiently specific measures to allow the GAC to assess actual performance at the end of the grant period.

10–12 | Good
Identifies measurable outcomes and reasonable objectives. Provides an appropriate measurement strategy and identifies relevant data and tools, although targets or measurement detail may be somewhat limited.

6–9 | Adequate
Identifies goals or measurable activities but provides limited meaningful outcome measures. Data collection and measurement methods are present but general or incomplete.

1–5 | Weak
Outcomes are vague, difficult to assess, or primarily limited to activities or the number of residents served. Limited evidence of a meaningful measurement strategy.

0 | Insufficient
Does not identify meaningful outcomes, measurable objectives, or a credible method for tracking results.

7) Budget & Cost Effectiveness — 10 Points

Application Question 21

Reviewers should evaluate whether the requested funds are clearly connected to the proposed activities and expected outcomes and whether the major expenses are reasonable for the proposed scope of work.

9–10 | Strong
Clearly identifies major expenses and demonstrates a strong, direct relationship between requested funds, proposed activities, and expected outcomes. Expenses appear necessary and reasonable in relation to the proposed project and scope.

7–8 | Good
Clearly identifies major expenses and provides a reasonable connection between requested funds and proposed activities and outcomes. Costs generally appear reasonable for the proposed effort.

4–6 | Adequate
Provides an understandable budget but offers limited explanation of how major expenses support proposed activities or expected outcomes. Reasonableness of some costs may be unclear.

1–3 | Weak
Budget is unclear, inadequately supported, or demonstrates a limited relationship between requested funds and proposed activities or outcomes.

0 | Insufficient
Does not demonstrate reasonable use of requested funds.

8) Sustainability & Leveraging Other Resources — 10 Points Total (5 pts each question) Application Questions 22 & 23

Reviewers should evaluate whether the applicant clearly identifies the resources supporting or expected to support the project, explains the specific funding gap addressed by City funding, and provides a credible plan for sustaining the project after the grant period. A project should not be viewed as less deserving solely because it has other sources of funding. Reviewers should consider whether CBF funding fills a documented gap, expands access or impact, or enables a specific component of the proposed project that otherwise could not be implemented.

5 | Strong

Clearly identifies major funding and other resources supporting or expected to support the project, including amounts, status, and applicable restrictions. Clearly identifies the specific funding gap that City funding would address and what CBF funding would make possible. Provides a credible and realistic plan for sustaining the project after the grant period. Clearly explains the anticipated impact if CBF funding is not available.

4 | Good

Identifies major funding sources and resources and provides a reasonable explanation of the funding gap. Clearly describes how City funding would support the proposed project and provides a generally credible sustainability plan.

3| Adequate

Provides some information about other resources and sustainability but does not clearly establish the specific funding gap, role of City funding, or long-term plan.

1–2 | Weak

Limited information regarding other resources or sustainability. Unclear what GAC funding would make possible.

0 | Insufficient

Does not adequately address other resources, the need for GAC funding, or sustainability.