

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B: Program
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center	Maternal and Infant Health	62	24	Good Samaritan does not describe how the organization's work aligns with the goals of DKl.	6
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center	Maternal and Infant Health	80	30		10
Good Samaritan Family Resource Center	Maternal and Infant Health	69	24	Good Samaritan Resource Center did a strong job outlining their organization's mission, history, and overall track record. Their focus on supporting Latinx families through programs that strengthen family systems, promote early childhood education, and advance educational equity clearly aligns with the RFP's emphasis on community empowerment and cultural inclusion. However, the two program examples provided lacked sufficient detail. The descriptions were brief and did not clearly articulate the design, implementation, or impact of each program. Additionally, while the organization mentioned serving marginalized communities, they did not specify any work with African American communities or other historically underserved populations in San Francisco, which is a key component of the RFP. On a positive note, the proposal did an excellent job highlighting the lived experience and qualifications of key staff. With 91% of staff identifying as Latino, 96% bilingual in Spanish and English, and 65% being parents themselves, the team reflects the community they serve. This representation enhances cultural responsiveness and ensures that leadership, service delivery, and decision-making are rooted in the lived realities of their participants.	10

	C: Deliverab		D: Detailed		E: Outreach
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
GS does not convey an understanding or articulation of the maternal and infant health disparities in San Francisco and does not speak to how their programming would address such disparities, particularly for the DK1 target populations.	8	GS does not provide a thoughtful workplan. It seems like a repackaging of existing programs and does not specify how their work will meet the city's needs as described in the maternal and infant health service area.	6	The budget table and narrative reflect significant set asides for staffing/administrative support (4 positions). Application does not explain how GS will leverage other resources.	6
Good Samaritan Resource Center clearly articulated the purpose, objectives, and intended impact of their proposed program, with strong alignment to the Service Area priorities outlined in the RFP. They provided a structured overview of the program design and engagement strategies, giving a clear picture of how the program would operate. However, the proposal did not include a timeline for implementation or describe how the program would be adapted to meet the specific needs of diverse community members. While the long-term impact was well explained, particularly for Latinx and Spanish-speaking communities, the services appear narrowly focused. The proposal lacked details on how accessibility and inclusivity would be extended to other historically marginalized populations, such as African American and Asian, Pacific Islander. As written, the program appears limited in scope, which could affect equitable participation across San Francisco's marginalized populations.	11	Good Samaritan Resource Center provided a detailed and well-structured explanation of their key deliverables, work plan, and operational logistics. The proposal clearly outlined the roles and responsibilities of key personnel, with an emphasis on community-rooted leadership and culturally responsive practices. In terms of risk management, the organization acknowledged recent challenges such as staffing vacancies and budget constraints. They addressed these issues by promoting staff whenever possible to fill critical roles and leveraging foundation funding to bridge budget gaps. Additionally, in response to participant concerns related to the current administrative climate, they have adapted by shifting meetings to a virtual platform to maintain engagement and ensure service continuity. Overall, their approach to operational planning and risk mitigation was thoughtful and responsive to the needs of their community.	7	The submitted budget is clear, well-structured, and aligns with the goals outlined in the RFP. It includes appropriate allocations for staffing, participant support, accessibility, and program operations. Strengths include strong investment in participant-facing supports such as emergency assistance, transportation, and food, as well as thoughtful inclusion of language access and staff training. However, the budget appears administrative-heavy, with a large portion dedicated to staff salaries and fringe. While staffing is crucial to service delivery, the proposal would benefit from a clearer justification of how these roles directly support program outcomes. Additionally, there is no mention of leveraging additional resources or in-kind contributions, which could enhance the program's sustainability and reach.	10
	12		7		6

F: Evaluatio

G:
Letters of

Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale
The outreach plan relies on existing outreach infrastructure, which is troublesome since this grant intends to serve a more expansive population than those GS currently serves.	9		3 Points	Letters are generic and lack specificity.
Good Samaritan Resource Center provided a strong overview of their outreach strategy, demonstrating a clear understanding of culturally relevant and community-driven engagement. They utilize family-centered outreach methods, such as engaging parents who are program alumni and connecting with families in San Francisco schools. They also leverage multiple communication channels, including community events, newsletters, and social media. The use of Spanish-only and bilingual materials supports multilingual accessibility, though it may be beneficial to broaden language support for other underserved groups in San Francisco to ensure equitable access across diverse populations. Additionally, the organization demonstrated strong and long-standing partnerships with various community organizations, some dating back to 2012, which effectively expand their reach and deepen program impact. While their outreach is well-rooted in the Latinx community and effectively uses peer-to-peer and community-based strategies, expanding their accessibility efforts to include additional languages and accommodations for other historically underserved populations could further enhance inclusivity.	9 7	Good Samaritan Resource Center presents a plan for tracking, measuring, and reporting key performance metrics. The organization uses Salesforce as its central data system to capture participant demographics, track referrals and registrations, and monitor program impact. Their approach includes the use of evidence-based assessment tools such as the Parenting Scale, the Family Development Matrix, and the Community of Care Survey. These tools allow for both quantitative and qualitative data collection that support ongoing evaluation of participant progress and program effectiveness. To ensure community voice and program alignment, participant feedback is gathered at the end of each program cycle and is shared anonymously with the Parent Advisory Council for insight. The Parent Advisory Council plays a role in representing the voice of the community and contributes directly to program improvement. Additionally, Good Samaritan partners with external evaluators and consultants to review progress and ensure alignment with organizational and programmatic goals across all departments. However, it was not clearly articulated how the organization ensures compliance with City-specific reporting requirements outlined in the RFP, particularly in terms of transparency and accountability to funders	3 Points 3 Points	The organization did submit both required letters, but since the wording was exactly the same in each, just signed by different people, it takes away from the strength of the recommendation. This makes it harder to see a broad range of support and doesn't do much to show the organization's cultural responsiveness or the impact they've had in the community.