

The Apple Orchard dba PGS

NEIGHBORHOOD PURPOSES GRANT PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

Use this form to evaluate the merit of each Neighborhood Purposes Grant application.

Grant Applicant's Name: The Apple Orchard dba PGS

Date: 05-05-14

Reviewer's

Name: Nick Greif

PART I: ELIGIBILITY

1. Is the organization a nonprofit agency with tax-exempt status under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Yes _____ No _____

2. Do the programs and services of the organization primarily serve residents of your Neighborhood Council area?

Yes _____ No _____

3. Does the organization have an office/staff located in your Neighborhood Council area?

Yes _____ No _____

PART II: FUNDING PRIORITIES

1. Which of the following priority areas does the proposed project align with:

Education

Civic Engagement

Health

Neighborhood Improvements

Human Services

Other

Arts/Culture

2. Does the proposed project primarily serve residents of your Neighborhood Council?

Yes _____ No _____

3. Will the proposed project be complete within one fiscal year (July 1-June 30)?

Yes _____ No _____

4. Does the proposed project have a budget of \$5,000 or less (does not require City contract)?

Yes _____ No _____

5. Does the proposed project have a budget of \$5,001 or more (requires City contract)?

Yes _____ No _____

6. Does the proposed project have a budget of \$20,001 or more (requires City contract and approval from the Department's General Manager and the Board of Neighborhood Commissioners)?

Yes _____ No X

PART III: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

1. Does any Neighborhood Council board member have a conflict of interest with the grant applicant?

Yes _____ No X

PART IV: SCORING FORM

Instructions: Please use the rating scale below to score the elements in Sections A-E. A score should be assigned to the statement to indicate the extent to which the proposal addresses the corresponding statement.

Rating Scale

1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Excellent
The proposal has serious deficiencies. Not likely to recommend for funding.	The proposal somewhat addresses this element and is lacking some information. Likely to recommend for funding.	The proposal addresses this element in a satisfactory manner and provides adequate information. Recommend for funding.	The proposal fully addresses this element and is well articulated. Strongly recommend for funding.

Score / Max. Score

Section A: Agency Experience

The organization possesses expertise in working with the specified target population(s) and has a history working in the identified target area(s).

4 / Out of 4

Section B: Identified Need

The organization clearly identified the proposed need for the project and provided relevant information on the target population(s) and target area(s) to be served by the project.

3 / Out of 4

Section C: Measurable Objectives and Expected Outcomes

The organization clearly articulated the measurable objective(s) and expected outcome(s) for assessing the progress of the proposed project.

1 / Out of 4

Section D: Project Timeline

The organization clearly described the project activities and necessary steps for completing the proposed project within the indicated period or time.

2 / Out of 4

Section E: Merit of Proposal

The overall merit of the proposal illustrates a project that aligns with one of the primary objectives of the Neighborhood Council : (1) improving the physical infrastructure of the community or, (2) improving community engagement and problem-solving capacity.

2 / Out of 4

Total Points: 12 / Out of 20

Section F: Overall Comments

Please offer the applicant any comments, suggestions or feedback in the areas below.

(Note: This information will be utilized to provide applicants with general feedback on their overall proposal.)

1. Positive aspects of the proposal:

Proposed project entails positive neighborhood improvement aspects. Efforts to remove graffiti, pick up bulk items, and clean gutters are all clear needs of the community and worthy of receiving funds for completion.

2. Areas for improvement:

Though the proposal proposes to conduct neighborhood improvement, the implementation timeline and details are unclear. As Apple Orchard and its for profit arm are contracted by the City of Los Angeles to complete these task already in the community area, it was also unclear what additional community benefit was being provided by the project. Thus, in future applications, which we encourage the applicant to apply for, full funding is more likely to be granted if the project spells out 1. the timeline of the improvement 2. how the project will provide benefits to the community beyond what the applicant is required to already by the City and 3. include a reporting mechanism to notify the community of the work completed.

3. General impressions and/or feedback:

Overall we find the goals of this project to be worthy and of need for the community. We would like to see additional details of the additional benefits provided by the project above what the applicant is contracted to provide already and a reporting mechanism to identify the work once it is completed.

Name of Reviewer: Nick Greif Date: 05-05-14