

# 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. 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 Public Service; 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)
<b>Section II, Part II, question B</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 <b>NO</b> data was included.

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

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<b>Section II, Part II, questions C, D, E, and Section II, Part III, all questions</b>  <b>Physical Projects:</b> 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 <b>detailed</b> 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 <b>basic</b> 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 <b>minimal</b> 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 (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<b>Section II, Part II, questions F, G, H, and I</b>  <b>Physical Projects:</b> 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 <b>new venture</b> and provided <b>little or no</b> evidence that the organization has successfully operated a similar program/project in the past.

**Question 4:** Clearly defined how the program/project success will be measured in qualitative and quantitative measurements.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<p><b>Section II, Part III, all questions</b>  <b>Physical Projects:</b> Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question depending on what type of physical project is proposed.</p>	<p>The narrative provided <b>specific</b> outcomes for the participants, measurable outcomes for the Tulsa community and indicated <b>specific</b> efforts to conduct follow-up tracking to ensure outcomes are met.</p>	<p>The narrative provided outcomes for participants, and stated general outcomes for the Tulsa community. The follow-up tracking was mentioned, but not specific to ensure outcomes are met.</p>	<p>The narrative provided <b>little or no</b> measurable outcomes for the participants or any substantive benefits for the Tulsa community. <b>Little or no</b> follow-up tracking was indicated.</p>

**Question 5:** Presented realistic long-term expectations and outcomes.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<p><b>Section II, Part II, question J, Part III, all questions, Section III Financial Information, and Budget Tables</b>  <b>Physical Projects:</b> Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question depending on what type of physical project is proposed.</p>	<p>The stated outcomes appear to be attainable during the grant program year with the proposed staff and financial resources.</p>	<p>The stated outcomes <b>MIGHT</b> be attainable during the grant program year with the proposed staff and financial resources.</p>	<p>The stated outcomes do <b>NOT</b> appear to be attainable during the grant program year with the proposed staff and financial resources.</p>

**SECTION III. Program/Project Financial Information (11 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.

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

**Question 7:** Provided a realistic timeframe of how funds will be spent.

Application Reference	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<b>Section III, question E</b> <b>Physical Projects:</b> Other questions in Section II may need to be reviewed to answer this question, depending on what type of physical project is proposed.	Information provided appeared to be reasonable and realistic to complete during the grant program year and/or information provided included a justification on when grant funds would be spent.	Information provided did <b>NOT</b> appear to be reasonable or realistic to complete during the grant program year.

**Question 8:** Described how program / project will be sustained past the grant cycle.

Application Reference	Excellent (3)	Acceptable (1)	Unacceptable (0)
<b>Section III, question J</b>	The narrative provided <b>specific</b> information to indicate the program/project would continue after the grant program year ended regardless of additional grant funding in successive years.	The narrative provided <b>some</b> information to indicate that the program/project would continue after the grant program year ended, but provided no specific information for other funding sources in successive years.	The narrative <b>little or no</b> assurance that the program/project would continue after the grant program year ended unless additional grant funds continued to be awarded in successive years.

**Question 9:** Budget included accurate calculations.

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>Acceptable (1)</b>	<b>Unacceptable (0)</b>
<b>Executive Summary, Section III, question K, and Budget Tables</b>	Financial information was <b>accurate and consistent</b> in all parts of the application.	Financial information was <b>NOT accurate OR was NOT consistent</b> in all parts of the application.

**Question 10:** Provided documentation to verify leveraged funds that are specific to support program/project.

<b>Application Reference</b>	<b>Excellent (3)</b>	<b>Acceptable (1)</b>	<b>Unacceptable (0)</b>
<b>Executive Summary, Section III, question K, Budget Tables, Grant Certification Form 3, and Attachment #19</b>	Information provided a <b>substantial</b> amount of additional sources of funds to support the program/project and included documentation with the application to verify the amounts and when the funds would be received by the organization.	Information provided <b>some</b> additional sources of funds to support the program/project and some of the documentation submitted with the application did verify the amounts and/or when the funds would be received by the organization.	Information provided <b>little or no</b> additional sources of funds to support the program/project and documentation submitted was inadequate to substantiate the amounts or when the funds would be received by the organization.