Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score
Generational Breaks	Community Health & Wellness	83
Generational Breaks	Community Health & Wellness	69
Generational Breaks	Community Health & Wellness	80

I	A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness				
ı	Category Score		Optional Rationale	Category Score	
3		30		12	
9			Well crafted would like to see more examples of how past events were effective what they accomplished Generational Breaks showed strong lived experience and community roots (HOPE SF, Bayview). Clear cultural responsiveness (Zulu practices, trauma-informed lens), community co-creation (listening circles, surveys), and relevant partners (US4US, 5 Keys, Rafiki, YCD). Would benefit from more recent quantitative impact data and staff	11	
J		29	bios/credentials beyond the founder to reach "Excellent."	12	

	C: Delivera	b	D: Detailed	j	E: Outreach
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Would like more detail on how the outreach will occur. Will it be only through flyers and social media? For example, more detail on how trusted		15		7	10
community partners will be leveraged to engage potential participants. Clear purpose and objectives; 8 cohorts over 2 years; trauma-informed + culturally grounded workshops; referrals to licensed therapists; annual Wellness Markets. Engagement strategies and timeline are concrete. Minor gaps: how curriculum adapts across age/disability/language groups; escalation protocols for higher-acuity needs could be spelled out.		Specific deliverables and outputs (8 cohorts, >160 participants, ≥40 referrals, surveys, quarterly reports). Roles/responsibilities are clear logistics and market events are defined; risk mitigation addressed (backup facilitators, space safety, debriefs, buffers). Could further detail partner MOUs and contingency plans if sites/partners shift. but over Generational Breaks showed a clear work plan.	,	4 Lacks a detailed budget narrative Narrative references an inserted Attachment II, but no budget table or line-item narrative appears here. Without allocations (FTEs, fringe, supplies, space, incentives, translation/ADA, evaluation, insurance, indirects), feasibility and allowability can't be verified. Score will rise with a complete table + narrative 4 linking costs to deliverables.	9

F: G: Evaluatio Letters of

					•
Optio	onal Rationale	Category	Optional Rationale	Category	Optional Rationale
		Score		Score	
			9	0 Points	The letters submitted were identical outside of the heading.
	re is a lack of detail for how multilingual outreach will be conducted a lack of detail for how disability accommodations will be addressed		7	0 Points	The applicant appears to have submitted one letter twice. The same letter was uploaded twice.
truste Bayv acce	i-layered plan (mailers, boosted ads, flyers, word-of-mouth through ted orgs; partner newsletters/events). Tailored to HOPE SF and view with attention to visibility and trust. To max out: add language ess specifics (which languages), ADA accommodations examples, outreach KPIs (conversion targets, RSVP/show rates).		Mixed-methods plan with defined metrics (attendance/retention, pre/post scales, satisfaction, referrals, market engagement) and quarterly reporting; feedback loops with participants/partners. Would improve with a brief logic model, data governance (privacy/IRB/DPA as applicable), named 8 tools/scales, and defined success thresholds per metric.		