

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B:
					Program
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Soul of Pride	Community Health & Wellness	72	30		9
Soul of Pride	Community Health & Wellness	54	20	From this section, I'm not seeing a clear relationship to the priorities outlined in the RFP around improving health education, preventative screenings, and fitness programs that directly promote wellness.	8
Soul of Pride	Community Health & Wellness	77	27	Soul of Pride has strong leadership credentials, long Bay Area presence, 11 multilingual capacity, Pride stages and youth summits cited. Clear commitment to equity and inclusion, but light on specific, recent, quantified outcomes (e.g., # youth served, % improvements, demographics served, retention/completion), formal policies/processes (e.g., language access SOPs, trauma-informed protocols), and documented community co-design beyond general statements.	

	C: Deliverab		D: Detailed		E: Outreach
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
There is a lack of detail about the program components. While it is clear there will be two tracks the type of materials that will be covered during sessions is unclear. Also the depth of training regarding workforce development is not clearly detailed. Target population is clear; dual tracks (Education + Workforce) are well laid out; components and intent align with 7.1.2.3. Would benefit from a concrete 12-month timeline with dated milestones, named partners per activity, and clearer barrier-removal supports (stipends, transportation, meals, tech access) embedded in delivery.	10	There is no explanation around risk mitigation strategies. There is also a lack of clarity around who will do what as it relates to each program or track described.	7	I do not see a budget narrative so it is difficult to see how some costs are justified.	5
	10		4		4
	12	Logic model is solid with outputs/outcomes and roles listed (ED, Youth Director, PM, Ops, etc.). To max points, specify FTE allocations, weekly cadence, participant-to-staff ratios, and a crisp risk/contingency plan (backup facilitators, virtual pivot, safety protocols).	7	Comprehensive, detailed line items with categories across staff, fringe, overhead, outreach, transportation, curriculum, supplies, venues.	7
				Includes food, technology, and field trips to reduce barriers for youth.	
				Fiscal sponsor fee (10%) clearly identified.	

F: Evaluation		G: Letters of	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
The outreach plan should be more comprehensive and explain how potential participants will be located and engaged to ensure adequate participation.	6		5 Points
	3	I'm not seeing how data will be collected or a methodology for evaluating the data. For example, which data will be collected and when.	5 Points
	8		5 Points
Commitment to partner with SFUSD, colleges, CBOs, and families.		Logic model includes short- and long-term outcomes (college/trade enrollment, job placement, alumni engagement).	
Translation and accessibility noted (though dependent on “translation software” rather than professional translators).		Strong evaluation plan with indicators, tools, timelines, and assigned responsible parties.	
Uses community/family engagement sessions to strengthen support.		Incorporates both qualitative and quantitative measures (pre/post, rubrics, alumni follow-up).	
Gaps:			
Needs detail on specific partner commitments (letters, MOUs).		Gaps:	
Accessibility addressed broadly, but no mention of ASL, captioning, or plain-language adaptation.		Some inconsistencies in long-term targets (e.g., alumni engagement % listed as both 5% and 75%).	
Outreach channels (social media, school counselors, faith-based, etc.) not detailed.		No mention of data privacy, consent/assent for minors, or secure storage of participant data.	