

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B: Program
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Homebridge Inc	Community Health & Wellness	90	31		14
Homebridge Inc	Community Health & Wellness	54	17	This proposal does not fit the Service Area objectives as outlined in Service Area 7.1.1.1 Community Health & Wellness of this RFP. This is a proposal for a workforce development program.	7
Homebridge Inc	Community Health & Wellness	91	32	Homebridge Inc. Nearly 40 years of service; ~400 trained caregivers serving ~1,100 high-needs clients/month with strong outcomes preventing hospitalization/institutionalization. Clear equity posture (BUILDE committee) and workforce that reflects community (detailed demographics). Strong, recent program examples (IHSS/CalAIM; VESL with high completion/placement). Could edge higher with more disaggregated client impact data (e.g., outcomes by population/zip).	13

	C: Deliverab		D: Detailed		E: Outreach
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
According to the proposal "Homebridge's VESL Home Care Immersion Program was developed to eliminate barriers to employment for immigrants, particularly those at risk of homelessness in San Francisco." While this program has great value, it is not consistent with the goals of this service area and it is intended to reach a specific community not the broader community including a diversity of participants.	15		7		8
	6		8		5
Purpose and objectives are crisp; paid 12-week cohorts with guaranteed placement; robust engagement strategies; clear timeline and planned scaling. Minor gaps: add clearer escalation protocols for higher-acuity learners and a short accessibility plan for learners with disabilities.		14 Homebridge, Inc. had Concrete outputs (graduation/retention targets at 6 and 12 months, coaching at 30/90/180 days), quarterly partner convenings, defined staffing matrix, and specific partner roles (MEDA, HSH, employer network). Risk mitigation is thoughtful (childcare, transit, mentorship). Would be perfect with MOUs and a contingency if key partners/funding shift.		9 Budget narrative ties costs to outcomes (admin + fringe, participant wages/benefits, indirects, certifications, transport, partner collaboration). Paid-training model aligns with equity/feasibility. Full table is referenced as attached; assuming allowability and math reconcile, this is fundable. One point held pending review of Attachment II line-by-line allowability/percent caps.	9

F: Evaluation		G: Letters of	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
This proposal does not align with reaching the target populations referred to in the RFP. The RFP calls for outreach to a diversity of groups including but not limited to African Americans in San Francisco.	10		5 Points
	8		3 Points
		Strong letters but do not provide evidence that the organization can provide services in alignment with this RFP.	
Strong, trust-based pipeline via MEDA, SEADC, HSH, shelters, CBOs; multilingual outreach, low-tech enrollment, in-person events, and caregiver referrals. Could be maximized by adding language list coverage targets and outreach KPIs (e.g., inquiry→enrollment→graduation conversion).		9 Mixed-methods plan: baseline assessment; placement and retention at 3/6/12 months; wage progression; satisfaction surveys; focus groups; employer feedback; quarterly impact reports; third-party evaluation. Add a brief logic model and data governance note (privacy/consent, storage, access) to fully button it up.	5 Points