

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B: Program Design & Implementation
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
Scholastic Interest Group	Leadership Development & Legal Support for Incarcerated & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals	72	28	The SIG programming demonstrates a clear and well-structured purpose, which is to support young males who are currently incarcerated by providing them with opportunities for personal development, positive decision-making, and future readiness. The program objectives emphasize fostering resilience, accountability, leadership skills, and preparation for successful reintegration into their communities. However, while the SIG program is strong for English-speaking incarcerated young men, it does not currently extend equitable access to monolingual youth or those from different cultural backgrounds who may not fully benefit from its curriculum. To ensure inclusion and broaden impact, other alternatives should be considered. Such as Language Access, which is listed in budget but cost not provided, cultural adaptations (partnering with other agencies). and lastly once youth complete SIG to consider other partnerships to other equivalent parenting groups.	10
Scholastic Interest Group	Leadership Development & Legal Support for Incarcerated & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals	69	29	Organizational background is generally aligned with the goals and priorities of the RFP. However, proposal does not strongly address community-engagement and community-led efforts as described in the RFP. Could provide more details for higher score, including prior project descriptions ex., # served, outcomes, program dates, etc.	7
Scholastic Interest Group	Leadership Development & Legal Support for Incarcerated & Formerly Incarcerated Individuals	81	33	The organization clearly defines its background and cultural. Two great men in leadership.	11

C: Deliverables & Work Plan		D: Detailed Budget		E: Outreach & Community Engagement	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
<p>The program operates on a clear 12-month timeline, giving participants and staff shared expectations for benchmarks and outcomes. However, while the milestones are well-defined during enrollment, the current structure does not outline a strategy for what happens after the 12-month mark. Without a transition or aftercare plan, it remains unclear how youth are supported to sustain progress or connect to long-term opportunities once they complete the program.</p>		<p>Though the SIG program has clearly outlined its roles, responsibilities, and expectations for incarcerated youth. The structure demonstrates intentional planning around group facilitation, youth engagement, and alignment. This clarity provides a strong foundation for staff and participants to understand what is expected and how program is to operate but its data tracking and measuring outcomes remains unclear. Based on what SIG provided to strengthen this area alternatives to practice can look like the following: completion of program vs non - completion, progress indicators, what are the post follow up metrics (recidivism, school re - engagement in the community) other program alternatives.</p>		<p>The submitted budget provides a general outline of projected costs and allocations to support SIG program, but certain costs reflected to be inconsistent with the expectations of program. It would be best to highlight a complete cost breakdown and identify gaps or overlaps.</p>	8
		<p>Proposal outlines some good quantitative outcome measures and target numbers for youth served. Description of volunteer mentors and their oversight is missing.</p>		<p>Executive Director/Project Coordinator role is described as primarily oversight and reporting, but is not described as hands on with service delivery. .5 FTE does not seem in line with this. It is unclear how the Program Coordinator will work closely with participants when allotted hours in the budget equates to 16 hours per month. Issuing stipends to youth, especially if youth are in custody, requires additional description to ensure appropriate controls.</p>	8
<p>Program will be working with the young people while in the Juvenile Justice Center, but what happens to those who are released early? They are very good but not excellent.</p>		<p>The roles of the staff mentioned are clear of how they will operate the project.</p>	8	<p>The budget outline is very good.</p>	8

F: Evaluation & Reporting		G: Letters of Recommendation		
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale
Though the SIG submission demonstrates a well-balanced approach to evaluate in both quantitative and qualitative data metrics. It is important to note that SIG's community partnerships appear to be primarily concentrated within District 10 (Bayview). While this localized focus provides strong neighborhood connections and resources, it may unintentionally limit the accessibility of services for youth who come from across San Francisco. Since youth incarcerated at the Juvenile Justice Center will eventually re-enter communities throughout the city, it remains unclear whether SIG's services can be equally accessed by youth residing outside of Bayview. Can SIG offer Citywide accessibility, what are other partners involved, Can SIG be mobile or provide virtual programming, what does youth reintegration look like. By maintaining a good data driven approach while broadening other local communities all youth can benefit from the program's services and support.	10		3 Points	SIG has submitted two letters of recommendation in support of its proposal. While these letters demonstrate a level of community endorsement, the strength of the recommendations could be enhanced through broader representation. In particular, stronger letters of support from San Francisco district leaders, community advocates, and partner organizations would reinforce the depth of SIG's partnerships and its engagement across the city.
Proposal generally addresses the prompt, but could better describe existing warm referral relationships.		Proposal includes quite a list of evaluation strategies and metrics but it suggests a lack of clarity. May not be sufficiently intentional especially given the small number of 6 people who will be served and the small staffing plan.	3 Points	One letter is strong, one is moderate.
The proposal speaks very good on outreach and community engagement.		The proposal is set to perform tracking and measuring key 8 performance indicators for the project.	3 Points	Letters of support but are not strong.