

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B: Program
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Freedom Forward	Community Health & Wellness	95	32	I appreciated how they integrated community/participant voice into their response. The proposal strongly demonstrates cultural responsiveness, grounding services in youth leadership, lived experience, and community empowerment. It provides two strong past program examples (FAM & Jasmine Strong) that were adopted by government entities, plus a current Self-Determination Fund with measurable impact. Leadership reflects the communities served, with staff bringing lived experience (foster care, homelessness, immigration). Slight reduction from full points because while the examples are compelling, there could be more quantifiable outcomes for past programs (e.g., number of youth served, 32 evaluation results).	15
Freedom Forward	Community Health & Wellness	95	35		15
Freedom Forward	Community Health & Wellness	95	32		14

Optional Rationale	C: Deliverab		D: Detailed		E: Outreach	
	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	
The HYPE Center program design is well-articulated, with clear objectives (healthcare access, body autonomy, trust-building) and innovative components (Drop-In Clinic, body-positive fitness, alternative healing). Engagement strategies and a detailed timeline for the Drop-In Clinic launch are strong. The narrative includes youth voice (quotes) and community partnerships. Deducted points for limited detail on	15		9		9	
	13	Risk mitigation strategies could be more fully explained	10		7	
		The deliverables are clearly measurable (e.g., 800 screenings, 300 workshop participants, 100 fitness classes). The work plan outlines roles, staffing, and partnerships, with strong risk mitigation strategies (multiple healthcare partners, contingency planning, diversified funding). The clear breakdown of staff responsibilities is a strength. Slight deduction because some deliverables could be more outcomes-focused (e.g., improvements in health outcomes, self-efficacy), not just service counts.		The budget narrative is clear, linking staff roles and costs to program impact. Personnel expenses and fringe are aligned with program delivery and compliance needs. Strong alignment with equity values (fair compensation, trauma-informed services). Deducted points since the full budget table (Attachment II) was not included in the narrative yet, and some costs (like equipment/furnishings for the Drop-In Clinic) are referenced but not broken down in the narrative.	10	

F: Evaluation		G: Letters of	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
	10		5 Points
I would like more details regarding the outreach plan and specifics for how clients or community members are to be engaged.	10	Very detailed and comprehensive evaluation and reporting plan including use of validated tools such as SSM and SES tools.	5 Points
The strategy is youth-driven, leveraging peer outreach, Youth Advisory Board, community events, and culturally relevant partnerships. Accessibility considerations (multilingual services, gender-affirming care, culturally responsive practices) are included. Deducted one point because outreach strategies for harder-to-reach youth (e.g., street outreach, coordination with probation or foster systems) could be described in more detail.		The proposal includes quarterly feedback loops, cloud-based systems, independent evaluation (UC Berkeley partnership), and a commitment to transparency. It mentions measurable outputs (screenings, workshops, participation), but stops short of describing a clear methodology for qualitative and quantitative data analysis, or specific performance indicators tied to City reporting requirements. Deducted points for limited discussion of longitudinal tracking of youth outcomes.	5 Points