

City of Tulsa Grants Administration Reviewer Guide

Application Overview

The City of Tulsa receives annual grants from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Each year, the City notifies a mass distribution list of the availability of funds and holds mandatory workshops for all agencies/organizations interested in applying for a grant. Projects that can be funded range from multi-unit new construction rental housing projects to after school programs for youth. All HUD grants target housing and community development projects to serve low and moderate income individuals or to eliminate blight. Every year the majority of the proposals the City receives are from non-profit public service organizations who compete for approximately \$500,000 in funding (**this is subject to change**). To assist the City of Tulsa HUD Community Development Committee (CDC) in determining which proposed projects should be recommended for funding, all proposals are scored by five different evaluators to determine an average overall score for the proposal.

General Review Information

On the following pages, we have listed each question with a scoring matrix to assist you in your review and scoring determination. The left-hand column provides a reference to the questions in the application and any attachments which correspond to each question listed on the *Evaluation Scoring Worksheet*.

Make every effort to score applications consistently, particularly those of the same type (CDBG Essential Services; CDBG Physical, HOME, ESG, etc.). Comments are required any time full points are not awarded to support your evaluation, but all comments are welcomed. These comments are especially helpful to the facilitator and CDC if scores submitted by the five reviewers vary widely.

APPLICATION SCORING

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (No Score) - This part of the application should be used as a reference when scoring other parts of the application. Verify the information included here is consistent with the other parts of the application.

SECTION I. Organization Information (Grants Administration Staff Will Review - No Points) This section of the application may be used to understand more about the organization applying for funds but will not be scored by reviewers. Grants Administration staff will review this section of the application to ensure organizational capacity to administer Federal Funds and that the program/project submitted for grant funding consideration is an eligible program/project under each of the grant programs.

SECTION II. Program/Project Information (13 Total Possible Points) - This section will provide *specific* information on the program/project (who, what, when, where, and why).

Question 1: Clearly defined and supported the need for the program/project and included verifiable, published data sources.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Section II, Part II, question B	The narrative provided a justification for the need of the project/program AND it was supported by verifiable, published data sources.	The narrative provided a justification for the need of the project/program and some data, but did not provide any sources to verify the data.	The narrative provided a justification for the need of the project/program, but NO data was included.

Question 2: Thoroughly described project activities, project scope, and outcomes for target population.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Section II, Part II, questions C, D, E, and Section II, Part III, all questions Physical Projects: Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question depending on what type of physical project is proposed.	The narrative provided detailed information on what will be done, when and where the program/project will be conducted; how outcomes will be measured, and how persons served will benefit from participating.	The narrative provided basic information on what will be done, when and where the program/project will be conducted; how outcomes will be measured, and how persons served will benefit from participating.	The narrative provided minimal information on what will be done, when and where the program/project will be conducted. Provided little or no information on how outcomes will be measured or how persons served will benefit from participating.

Question 3: Organization has previous experience in operating the program or delivering similar services.

Application Reference	Acceptable (3)	Unacceptable (0)
Section II, Part II, questions G, H, I, and J Physical Projects: Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question depending on what type of physical project is proposed.	Evidence provided that this is an ongoing program/project, or the organization has successfully operated similar programs/projects in the past.	Organization indicated this is a new venture and provided little or no evidence that the organization has successfully operated a similar program/project in the past.

Question 4: Provided goals/objectives that are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (for both short-term AND long-term goals). (SMART goals).

Application Reference	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<p>Section II, Part III, Question A-1, and Question B-1</p> <p>Physical Projects: Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question depending on what type of physical project is proposed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative provided SMART (Specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time bound) short-term AND long-term goals for the proposed program/project. The narrative described benefits/outcomes that would occur during the program year for participants. The narrative described general lasting benefits/outcomes for the participants and the Tulsa community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative failed to provide SMART (Specific, Measurable, attainable, relevant, and time bound) short-term AND long-term goals for the proposed program/project. The narrative did NOT define realistic benefits/outcomes that would occur during the program year for participants. The narrative did NOT describe lasting benefits/outcomes for the participants and the Tulsa community.

Question 5: Clearly defined how the program/project success will be measured (for both short-term AND long-term goals).

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<p>Section II, Part III, Question A-2 AND Question B-2</p> <p>Physical Projects: Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question depending on what type of physical project is proposed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative clearly explained how and when the organization would measure outcomes, including tools, instruments, or tests to be utilized. The narrative provided a specific/clear plan for a follow-up tracking system reporting outcome sustainability beyond the program year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative provided some general information on how and when the organization would measure outcomes, including tools, instruments, or tests to be utilized. The narrative provided a general plan for follow-up tracking and reporting outcome sustainability beyond the program year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative did NOT explain how and when the organization would measure outcomes, including tools, instruments, or tests to be utilized. The narrative did NOT provide a plan for follow-up tracking reporting outcome sustainability beyond the program year.

SECTION III. Program/Project Financial Information (10 Total Possible Points) - This section of the application provides information on how the grant funds will be used and identifies other funds the organization will leverage to conduct the program/project. **NOTE: Reviewers will score 9 total possible points and Grants Administration will score 1 total possible point.**

Question 6: Provided justification for the program/project funding request. A financial rationale was provided and included credible and realistic costs.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Section III, questions A, B, C, D, E and Budget Tables Physical Projects: Part II, question C and F or Part III question C, and Cost Estimate Attachment	The narrative provided specific information on how costs for the program/project were determined. Administrative costs are less than 30% of the overall project cost . All costs seem reasonable for the stated outcomes.	The narrative provided general information on how costs for the program/project were determined. Administrative costs are more than 30% of the overall project cost . Unsure costs are reasonable for the stated outcomes.	The narrative provided vague information on how costs for the program/project were determined. Administrative costs seem significantly high . Costs do NOT seem reasonable for the stated outcomes.

Question 7: Provided justification for the economic feasibility of the project.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Section III, questions C Physical Projects: Part II, question C and F or Part III question C, and Cost Estimate Attachment	The narrative provided specific information on the economic feasibility of the project/program. Applicant performed a price analysis. Price / cost of the program are reasonable for the stated outcomes / beneficiaries.	The narrative provided generic information on the economic feasibility of the project/program. No price analysis was conducted. Unsure costs are reasonable for the stated outcomes / beneficiaries.	The narrative provided no information on how economically feasible the program/project is. Costs do NOT seem reasonable for the stated outcomes / beneficiaries.

Question 8: Budget tables included accurate calculations.

Application Reference	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Budget Tables	Financial information in the budget was accurate .	Financial information in the budget was NOT accurate .

Question 9: Financial information throughout the application was consistent and accurate.

Application Reference	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Executive Summary, Section III, question J, Budget Tables, and Grant Certification Form 3	Financial information was accurate and consistent in ALL parts of the application.	Financial information was NOT accurate OR was NOT consistent in ALL parts of the application.

Question 11: Provided documentation to verify the **committed** Non-HUD funding is **specific to support the program/project** during the grant program year (between July 1, 2026 – June 30, 2027).

Application Reference	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Grant Certification Form #3 and Attachment #19	<p>Documentation submitted was adequate to substantiate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the amounts listed on Certification Form #3, - the funds supported the specific program/project, and - the funds cover the grant program year timeframe of (July 1, 2026-June 30, 2027). <p>OR</p> <p>Provided Attachment #19 stating N/A if no funds were listed on Grant Certification Form #3</p>	<p>Documentation submitted did NOT substantiate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the amounts listed on Certification Form #3, - the funds supported the specific program/project, and/or - the funds cover the grant program year timeframe of (July 1, 2026-June 30, 2027). <p>OR</p> <p>Did NOT provide Attachment #19 stating N/A if no funds were listed on Grant Certification Form #3</p>