

Scoring Criteria

Public Services/Homeless Assistance

Community Impact

Community Need (0-30 Points) – Reviewers will score this category based upon the overall impact that the proposed program will have in addressing a community development need identified in the Consolidated Plan. Reviewers will consider the extent to which the proposed program is needed in the community by considering other known similar programs in the community, the actual number of people to be served, and the impact if the program were not funded.

Lake County Impact (0-25 Points) – A formula will be used to determine 10 points of the score in this category. It is based on the percentage of Lake County entitlement client and the difference between that percentage and the percentage of the budget request. A reminder that Lake County is able to fund programs that serve Waukegan and North Chicago clients as well, but its emphasis will be placed on clients served in the Lake County entitlement area. The remaining 15 points will be scored by the reviewers and will be based on the overall impact to the County.

Outcomes (0-20 Points) – The reviewers will score this section based upon how well the outcomes are written for the proposed program. The application should include client-based outcomes that identify benefits or changes for individuals or populations as a direct result of participating in the proposed program. Outcomes should be focused, measurable, meaningful, specific, attainable, and identify a change in the clients' knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, behaviors, and/or condition. The strategies, mechanisms for measurement, target dates and rationale should also be clear and understandable. The long-term effects should reflect a general benefit to the community, in line with what is stated in the Con Plan goals.

Program Quality

Program Design (0-40 Points) – The reviewers will score this section based upon how well the program is expected to efficiently and effectively accomplish its proposed program outcomes. The reviewer may consider whether the program follows a proven model, whether the design seems reasonable, and whether the program has sufficiently prepared to overcome obstacles.

The reviewer will also evaluate the level to which the program is able to collaborate with other agencies in the community. Stronger programs share their resources with others and similarly benefit from collaboration as well.

The reviewer will also consider how well the program is able to follow-up with their clients' progress, assess their levels of satisfaction and provide adequate referrals if further intervention is needed. Programs should be prepared to prevent further escalation of clients' problems.

Staffing and Facilities (0-15 Points) – The reviewer will score this section based upon the program management and the institutional knowledge of the agency and program by considering: the staff levels of experience and training, availability in full-time positions; and the staff turnover. The reviewer will consider how well the agency is equipped to run the program successfully and how well secured their location is.

Agency Capacity

Past Performance (0-30 Points) –The reviewer will score this section based upon the overall history of the program and agency in successfully achieving their outcomes and effectively providing services. The reviewer will assess the program’s readiness and capacity to undertake the proposed activity. The reviewer will also consider staff reports regarding the agency’s ability to successfully complete its application. If the agency has been funded in the past, reviewers will also take into account the performance in completing quarterly reports and vouchers in a correct, consistent and timely manner.

Fiscal Management (0-20 Points) – The reviewer will score this section based upon their assessment of the audit report and the Budgets and Financial Assessments for the Agency. Reviewers will evaluate the diversity and resilience of the various funding sources that support the agency and program and note the ratio of administrative and fund raising costs to total expenses.

Sustainability (0-20 Points) – The reviewer will score this section based upon whether it seems that there are sufficient resources for the program to complete its objectives within the program year. The reviewer will assess the organizational and fiscal viability of the program and agency in the near future.

2011 CDBG Public Services
Funding Recommendations

AGENCY	SCORE	GOAL	AMOUNT REQUESTED	Proposed Award
HealthReach	181.00	3.2.2	\$50,000	\$45,000
Nicasa	171.50	3.3.4	\$50,000	\$40,000
ChildServ	170.50	3.3.3	\$50,000	\$40,000
Zacharias Sexual Abuse Center	170.00	3.3.4	\$30,000	\$28,000
Lake Co Ctr for Independent Living	169.25	3.3.1	\$30,000	\$28,000
CASA Lake County	168.25	3.3.3	\$50,000	\$32,000
COOL	163.25	3.2.1	\$50,000	\$30,000
NorthPointe Resources	161.25	3.3.1	\$30,000	\$25,000
Big Brothers Big Sisters	159.25	3.3.3	\$25,000	\$25,000
Family Service	159.25	3.3.4	\$50,000	\$25,000
Tri-Con Child Care Center	159.00	3.3.3	\$35,000	\$25,000
YouthBuild Lake County	154.25	3.3.1	\$50,000	-
Family Network	154.00	3.2.2	\$35,000	-
HP Comm Nursery School & Day Care	154.00	3.3.3	\$50,000	-
CREW	153.00	3.3.4	\$50,000	-
Lake County Sheriff	149.50	3.3.3	\$50,000	-
Boys & Girls Club	148.50	3.3.3	\$50,000	-
OMNI Youth Services	148.25	3.3.4	\$50,000	-
Northern Illinois Food Bank	147.25	3.2.1	\$25,000	-
ElderCARE@ChristChurch	145.75	3.3.2	\$25,000	-
Mano a Mano Family Resource Center	138.00	3.3.3	\$35,000	-
Youth Conservation Corps (YCC)	136.50	3.3.1	\$50,000	-
I-PLUS	132.00	3.3.3	\$25,000	-
Avon Township	131.25	3.2.1	\$50,000	-
Barrington Career Center	130.25	3.3.1	\$25,000	-
Consumer Credit Counseling Services	129.00	3.3.3	\$25,000	-
Youth & Family Counseling	123.25	3.3.4	\$50,000	-
U of I Extension	120.00	3.2.1	\$25,000	-
Alexian Brothers The Harbor	119.50	3.3.4	\$41,150	-
Black Chamber of Commerce	102.75	3.3.1	\$50,000	-
Reviewers:	TOTAL		\$0	\$343,000

Gerald Dietz
Joe Mancino
Linda Pedersen
Burnell Russell