



## Working Cities Challenge Evaluation Criteria May 1, 2013

The Federal Reserve Bank of Boston and its partners have developed the following criteria for the Working Cities Challenge, which will be used by the independent jury of evaluators to judge proposals. Specific point totals for each section are included to provide applicants and the Jury members with clear guidance about the types of initiatives we are seeking to support through the Challenge. In determining the final scores for each proposal, the Jury will be asked to consider the following: 1) written application, including the narrative, budget and supporting materials; 2) any supplemental information requested after the initial application is submitted; 3) observations from site visits and/or interviews, if they are conducted.

<b><i>Threshold Criteria (must be met before the proposal will be considered by the Jury)*</i></b>
<b>a. Collaborative Team</b>
Partnership includes at least one member from each sector (public, private, non-profit)
<b>b. Local Match</b>
Proposed budget includes 20% local match funds
At least half of the local match will be provided in cash (the balance may be in-kind)
<b>c. Resources to Manage the Collaborative</b>
Budget includes resources for overall management and coordination of the collaborative
Staffing plan specifies one or more people who will manage the proposed initiative
<b>d. Lead Applicant's Experience and Capacity</b>
Lead applicant has audited financials for the past three years with no major findings
Lead applicant has included a reasonable overhead rate in the budget
<i>*The Bank is not obligated to make an award and reserves the right to reject any or all proposals or to waive any variations and irregularities without incurring any liability whatsoever.</i>
<b>I. Cross-sector Collaboration, Resident Engagement and Planning Process (Total of 40 points)</b>
<b>a. Strength of the local team- 10 points</b>
Extent to which the right decision-makers are at the table to achieve the desired results
Extent to which representative community members are part of the partnership
Clear definition of roles and responsibilities among partners
Mechanism in place for shared accountability among partners
Commitment to participation by senior leadership of collaborative members
Extent of experience among the partners working on the proposed issue area
<b>b. Breadth and depth of collaboration- 20 points</b>
Proposed initiative builds on an existing or emergent partnership



Local team is open to growth and has a history of incorporating new partners
Effective processes are in place for self-assessment and shared learning
Extent of connection/synergy between the proposed initiative and other local efforts
Financial or in-kind support from local partners indicates serious commitment to the initiative
<b>c. Resident engagement- 5 points</b>
Quality of resident engagement in the initiative
Extent of resident representation among staff, Board, and membership of participating groups
<b>d. Planning process- 5 points</b>
Evidence of meaningful consultation with groups working on similar issues in the city
Appropriate measures taken to reach immigrants, minorities, and lower-income people
<b>II. Systems Change and Impact on Lower-Income People (total of 40 points)</b>
<b>a. Systems analysis- 10 points</b>
Partners have clearly defined and provided evidence for the problem to be addressed
Partners have established a specific and measurable large-scale result they are seeking to achieve
Partners have a basic understanding of the systemic barriers to achieving the intended result
Partners have developed appropriate metrics for tracking progress towards the large-scale result
<b>b. Systems change- 10 points</b>
Partners have a well-developed work plan that is connected to their desired large-scale result
Proposed work plan is realistic and appropriately scaled to local needs and capacity
Partners have identified specific outcomes that are achievable during the period of this grant
Extent to which the initiative is accomplishing one or more of the following:
i) Developing and testing a new approach to policies, procedures, resource flows, or decision-making
ii) Fully implementing a change to policies, procedures, resource flows or decision-making
Likelihood that the initiative will create a permanent change after the grant funding is spent
<b>c. Economic health and well-being- 10 points</b>
Extent to which the initiative responds to the needs of lower-income residents
Extent to which the initiative will improve the economic health of lower-income people
Extent to which the initiative will improve the well-being of lower-income people
<b>d. Breadth, depth and longevity of impact- 10 points</b>
Share of lower-income population in the city that will be reached by the initiative
Depth of impact on lower-income people in the city
Longevity of impact on lower-income people in the city
<b>V. Measurement, Learning and Adaptation (Total of 10 points)</b>
The partners have systems in place or proposed for collecting data on impact
The partners have shown evidence of commitment to using data for learning and accountability
The partners are able to constructively learn from past mistakes
The partners exhibit an entrepreneurial approach to problem-solving
<b>VI. Additional Considerations (Total of 10 points)</b>
In this section, the jury will be asked to list important characteristics, impacts, or benefits of the proposal that are not captured in the previous sections. For example, this could include the severity of the need or challenge to be addressed, the degree of creativity exhibited by the partners or a novel type of collaboration, the efficient deployment of local resources, or the quality of grassroots engagement and civic leadership, among other considerations.