

MEMORANDUM

To: 2020 CDBG Priority Setting Task Force

From: Amanda Methot, HCD Compliance Officer

Date: July 23, 2020

Re: Scoring

History and Background, Current 5 Year Plan

The score card has remained the same throughout the 5 year plan. The major categories include Goal/Priority Impact/Community Need, Guiding Principles, Capacity to Deliver, and Partnership/Collaboration/Outreach. The point allocation for the major categories are as follows; Goal/Priority Impact/Community Need **33**, Guiding Principles **30**, Capacity to Deliver **25**, and Partnership/Collaboration/Outreach **max of 12**. The scoring matrix can be found at the end of this memo

The total points for each category have remained unchanged, this change can only occur with council approval. The Allocation Committee has historically talked about making changes to the major scoring categories, but did not create a proposal to bring to council. The Allocation committee does have the authority to move points within the sub categories of each larger scoring category. In years 2016-2019 the committee did not make any changes. In 2019-2020 the Committee chose to overhaul the point allocations in the sub categories. Changes were made at the December 12, 2018 meeting, below is an excerpt from the meeting minutes:

Scoring Matrix: Discussions and Changes

The Committee reviewed the current scoring matrix and asked staff about the changes they can make on a committee level. The Committee discussed the categories of partnerships, capacity to deliver, priority impacts, and guiding principles. Changes in point allocations are detailed below:

<i>Capacity to deliver (25 points),</i>	<i><u>Past Years</u></i>	<i><u>Development</u></i>	<i><u>Social Service</u></i>
• <i>Financial need:</i>	<i>5/5</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>6</i>
• <i>Leveraged funding:</i>	<i>5/5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>8</i>
• <i>Experience:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4</i>
• <i>Readiness to proceed:</i>	<i>7/5</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>4</i>
• <i>Financial stability:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Priority Impacts (33 points)</i>	<i><u>Past Years</u></i>	<i><u>Development</u></i>	<i><u>Social Service</u></i>
• <i>Goal:</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>12</i>
• <i>Priority impact :</i>	<i>Set 7 or 11</i>	<i>Set 7 or 11</i>	<i>Set 7 or 11</i>
• <i>Community need:</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>

<i>Guiding Principles (30 points)</i>	<i><u>Past Years</u></i>	<i><u>Development</u></i>	<i><u>Social Service</u></i>
• <i>Measurable community impact:</i>	<i>10/15</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>11</i>
• <i>Diversity:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>9</i>
• <i>Priority to lower incomes:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>9</i>
• <i>Consistency with City goals:</i>	<i>4/5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
• <i>Location:</i>	<i>4/X</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>X</i>
• <i>Sustainability:</i>	<i>4/X</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>X</i>

The Allocation committee felt that many of the categories were repetitive such as goal and consistency with City goals, hence they reduced the point allocation in the latter. In addition, the Committee felt that CDBG funds should truly be used for gap funding and chose to increase the financial need and leveraged funding point allocations. Lastly, balancing experienced organizations and new innovated programs has historically been a challenge. In an effort to create a more level playing field the committee reduced the experience and readiness to proceed point allocations.

A full breakdown of the internal scoring guide summary can be found at the end of the memo

2020-2021 Scoring Analysis

The Allocation Committee was blessed to have a member this past year that works in analytics and took an interest in the scoring data over the past 2 years. The member analyzed the data and produced a small report for the Committee. The full report can be found at the end of the memo

Report Findings

In the large scoring categories the percentage of maximum points were given out as follows

- Development
 - o Goals/Priority/Community Need, 89%
 - o Guiding Principles, 81%
 - o Capacity to Deliver, 81%
 - o Partnership/Collaboration/ Outreach, 86%
- Social Service
 - o Goals/Priority/Community Need, 93%
 - o Guiding Principles, 89%
 - o Capacity to Deliver, 82%
 - o Partnership/Collaboration/ Outreach, 88%

This data shows that the largest range in point allocations fall in the capacity to deliver section on both development and social service. It does not come as a surprise that Goals/Priority/Community Need and Partnership/Collaboration/ Outreach have a larger percentage of maximum points since both categories have point allocations attached to activities as well as MOU's and Letters of Support.

Sub-categories with largest and smallest percentage of points allocated are as follows;

Development	Social Service
-------------	----------------

HIGH (90-100%) • Priority Impact Level • Consistent with City Goals	HIGH (90-100%) • Goal • Priority Impact Level • Community Need • Priority to Lower Incomes • Consistent with City Goals • Readiness to Proceed • Financial Stability
LOW (65-75%) • Leveraged Funding • Financial Need	LOW (70-80%) • Financial Need • Leveraged Funding

Action Item

The Task Force can choose to change the point allocation within the large categories as well as the sub-categories. The total point allocation will stay at 100. The Task Force has made the decision to change the priority impact level to 5 points for a high priority activity and 0 for a priority activity, this change must be reflected in the final score card. The Task Force has also focused in on the collaboration portion of the application and increased the number of pages for MOU's and Letters of support from 2 to 5. This change should be taken in to consideration when finalizing the score card.

SCORING CATEGORIES AND POINT DISTRIBUTION

SCORING CATEGORIES AND POINT DISTRIBUTION

SCORING CATEGORY, SEE I.B FOR MORE INFORMATION	POSSIBLE POINTS
Guiding Principles: measurable community impact, diversity and inclusiveness, priority to lower incomes, consistent with city goals, plans, or initiatives	30 points
Capacity to deliver, including financial need, leveraged funding, experience providing service, readiness to proceed, and financial stability	25 points
Goal, Priority Impact Level & Community Need	33 points
Partnership/Collaboration, points distributed based on highest submitted documentation (MOA, LOS or Outreach) • Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) • Letter of Support (LOS) • Demonstrated Outreach	MOA maximum of 12 points LOS maximum of 9 points Outreach maximum of 6 points

PENALTY	POINTS DEDUCTED
Missing section/s	1 point deducted per item
Failing to follow Submission Guidelines, section I.C.3 (including but not limited to: application not typed, page limits, max/min request amounts, etc)	0.25 point deducted per instance
Errors (e.g. in budget calculation)	0.25 points deducted per instance

Internal Scoring Guide Summary 2019-2020

[illegible]

Variance of Scoring by Category

Notes

- Two categories that always score
- Finance categories more variable
- Development specific categories more variable
- Goal categories less variable
- Partner category...complicated

(Symbols)
Score Category

Variance Coefficient
of Scores (all)
Scores (development)
Scores (soc services)
Score Values

Goals

VarCo:
17%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Priority Impact Lvl

VarCo:
1%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Community Need

VarCo:
17%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Measure Comm Imp

VarCo:
21%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Diverse & Inclusive

VarCo:
19%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Priority to Lower Inc

VarCo:
16%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Consistent w City Goals

VarCo:
0%

1

Location

VarCo:
28%

1 2 3 4

Sustainability

VarCo:
32%

1 2 3 4 5

Financial Need

VarCo:
32%

1 2 3 4 5 6

Leveraged Funds

VarCo:
31%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Exp Prov Services

VarCo:
23%

1 2 3 4 5

Readiness to Proc

VarCo:
16%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Financial Stability

VarCo:
19%

1 2 3

Partner/Collab/Out

VarCo:
24%

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Maximum Score Possible

	Development			Social Services		
	2017/18	2019	+/-	2017/18	2019	+/-
Goal	7	12	+5	7	12	+5
Priority Impact Level	11	11	0	11	11	0
Community Need	15	10	-5	15	10	-5
Goal/Priority/ Comm Need	33	33		33	33	
Measurable Comm Impact	10	10	0	15	11	-4
Diversity & Inclusiveness	4	6	+2	5	9	+4
Priority to lower incomes	4	4	0	5	9	+4
Consistent w City Goals	4	1	-3	5	1	-4
Location	4	4	0	0	0	0
Sustainability	4	5	+1	0	0	0
Guiding Principles	30	30		30	30	
Financial Need	5	3	-2	5	6	+1
Leveraged Funds	5	6	+1	5	8	+3
Exp. Providing Service	4	5	+1	5	4	-1
Readiness to Proceed	7	8	+1	5	4	-1
Financial Stability	4	3	-1	5	3	-2
Capacity to Deliver	25	25		25	25	
PCO	12	12	0	12	12	0
Partner/Collab/Outreach	12	12	0	12	12	0
Total	100	100		100	100	

% Points Given Out of Maximum

	Development			Social Services		
	2017/18	2019	+/-	2017/18	2019	+/-
Goal	85%	85%	0%	87%	91%	4%
Priority Impact Level	99%	100%	0%	100%	97%	-3%
Community Need	83%	83%	0%	84%	92%	8%
Goal/Priority/ Comm Need	89%	89%		90%	93%	
Measurable Comm Impact	78%	79%	1%	82%	83%	1%
Diversity & Inclusiveness	88%	87%	-1%	85%	88%	3%
Priority to lower incomes	87%	85%	-2%	89%	95%	6%
Consistent w City Goals	89%	99%	9%	87%	99%	12%
Location	83%	80%	-3%			0%
Sustainability	81%	75%	-6%			0%
Guiding Principles	83%	81%		85%	89%	
Financial Need	78%	75%	-3%	79%	71%	-8%
Leveraged Funds	62%	68%	6%	76%	79%	3%
Exp. Providing Service	91%	88%	-3%	86%	89%	3%
Readiness to Proceed	87%	88%	0%	88%	94%	6%
Financial Stability	88%	81%	-6%	85%	90%	4%
Capacity to Deliver	81%	81%		83%	82%	
PCO	86%	86%	-1%	88%	88%	0%
Partner/Collab/Outreach	86%	86%	-1%	88%	88%	0%
Total	85%	84%		86%	88%	