| | | | A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness | | B: Program Design & Implementation |
| | | | Category Score | Optional Rationale | Category Score |
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score			
Five Keys Schools & Programs	Leadership Development & Legal Support for Incarcerated & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals	34	7	Of this area it lacks the in-depth information provided in bullet points. This organization does not capture (2) proven examples of past programs (not clear), does not provide specifics with those of lived experience or certain qualifications and lastly does not provide service delivery or Admin oversight to staff.	7
Five Keys Schools & Programs	Leadership Development & Legal Support for Incarcerated & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals	71	29	Proposal reflects history of cultural inclusion, trauma informed service, hiring people with lived experience. However, description is relatively high-level and could provide more detail for higher score (especially prior projects and key staff - proposal does not name key staff)	7
Five Keys Schools & Programs	Leadership Development & Legal Support for Incarcerated & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals	92	33	The program description completes the overall outline of the proposal with excellent.	15

	C: Deliverables & Work Plan		D: Detailed Budget		E: Outreach & Community Engagement	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale
Though this agency has outlined there purpose and objective, it was not efficient to providing what the structure entails from confined areas in a locked facility to the curriculum being taught. How will staff teach, what is the cross transitions look like from being in custody to out of custody. How are staff trained to support clients with re-entry support. What does support look like from In - custody to out of custody. Will they be provided a case manager for transitional supportive and educational needs.	4	What training will Staff be teaching (specifically), What college level courses will clients be a part of? Are these courses transferrable to other educational institutions, Are their preliminary training to students while in custody, How often will students gain access to learning digital literacy? If hardware fails, what are those modalities.	10		2	The reliance on a single partner, CCSF, while valuable, does not demonstrate a robust collaborative model. Building relationships with additional agencies, especially those that specialize in youth development, workforce readiness, and cultural enrichment, that would strengthen the school's ability to meet diverse needs. Another significant gap is the lack of consideration for disability accommodations. Without clear strategies to support students with disabilities, the school risks excluding a portion of the community it intends to serve. Finally, there is limited evidence of how this agency fosters trust and builds authentic relationships with students and families. Trust is not assumed it must be demonstrated through transparency, consistent communication, and co-creation of opportunities with the community. Expanding on these elements would not only strengthen credibility but also ensure sustainability.
Program design is tangentially aligned with the service area. Program design description is relatively high level and focused on enhancing classroom technology. While this is a valuable investment, it is not aligned with how this service area describes leadership development or legal support and strength of community impact it will deliver.	9	Describes strong partnerships Sheriff's Dept and City College but would be stronger with more detailed work plan, including target dates, #s to be served, etc.	5	Significant investment in classroom resources, which may not align sufficiently with the goals of community benefit for this service area. Small investment in barrier removal funds; higher investment in this area will increase community benefit as described in the RFP.	10	Describes good community engagement and outreach.
Excellent written statement of the program design and implementation.	15	The work plan is excellent with measurable outcomes. Clear success with the support of City College of San Francisco and the Sheriff Department.	9	The budget outline is acceptable with the number of staff, equipment, and resources needed to make this a successful project.	9	Excellent strategy to performing outreach through engagement with City College, community agencies and Workforce.

F: Evaluation & Reporting

Category Score	Optional Rationale

G: Letters of Recommendation

Category Score	Optional Rationale

Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale
1	While the school's intent is clear, there is a significant lack of planning around how student progress and program effectiveness are being tracked, measured, and reported. At this time, there is no evidence of a clear methodology or accountability system to capture key performance indicators such as student completion rates, percentage of successful versus unsuccessful students, or other outcome measures that reflect real impact. Without data, it becomes difficult to evaluate whether the curriculum is truly effective. Equally concerning is the absence of student feedback mechanisms that could inform whether the learning experience is meaningful, accessible, and aligned with their needs. Student voice is a critical component in assessing the quality of curriculum delivery and the lack of it undermines the ability to make informed improvements. The agency must demonstrate not only what is being done, but also how well it is working. Without these measures this could cause a challenge when delivering curriculum.	3 Points	While the partnership with CCSF is valuable, it highlights a limitation in the school's support network. Relying on a single partner does not demonstrate long-term sustainability or a robust pipeline of opportunities for students. It would be beneficial to see letters of support or commitments from four-year institutions that are willing to collaborate with this program. Such partnerships would strengthen the program's credibility, expand educational pathways for students, and show that higher education institutions are invested in their success beyond community college.
6	Description is high level. Could be more detailed and focused on the impact of how grant funding is proposed to be used for technology enhancements.	5 Points	Letters demonstrate strong support.
6	The measurements of success and reporting is good, but far from being perfect. I was looking to read about other means of showing a more critical way of success.	5 Points	Excellent letters of support.