

Exhibit B

Assessment:	PROPOSAL EVALUATION SCORING MATRIX					
Scoring System Rankings:	<i>Unacceptable</i>	<i>Less than good, below average</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Better than average</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Exemplary, the Best, or Impressive</i>
Grade:	0	1	2	3	4	5
Description:	<p>Application is deficient, late or incomplete. Procedural steps for submission were followed incorrectly or omitted; and/or the Application does not respond to the necessary program priorities outlined in the RFP process. The project's narrative description lacks coherence or is characterized by inconsistent statements with no supporting analysis, or it contains numerous errors.</p>	<p>Essential parts of application remain incomplete, upon submittal. Procedural steps may not be followed sufficiently well. Descriptions are mostly cursory, irrelevant, or unclear. Needed information is missing and/or presentation may be inconsistent, faulty. Proposal may also seek to pursue (in large measure or otherwise make primary) objectives unrelated to ED program priorities.</p>	<p>All procedural steps followed to minimum degree and a complete application was received on time. Narrative description of the project may be weak, have information missing or be unclear in part. On balance, the proposal does attempt to respond to ED program objectives and RFP requirements, although some minor inconsistencies may need to be addressed by the applicant.</p>	<p>Application provided is complete; all procedural steps have been followed well without significant errors or omissions of required information. Project narrative is coherent, appropriate in length and presented with supporting evidence and exhibits. Appropriate data and analysis is used to support reasons for investment request. No required information is missing from application. Project description is clearly identifiable as a response to specific ED program priorities.</p>	<p>Application is complete and demonstrates high-level understanding of City ED process and program objectives in response. Project narrative is concise, well written with strong supporting evidence and exhibits. Data and analysis is structured to reinforce argument for why the proposal directly benefits Cedar Rapids. When taken together, all materials make a compelling case for investment by supporting competitiveness in the Cedar Rapids economy.</p>	<p>Application excels in quality of response to program priorities. Project narrative shows high-level of professional competency and understanding of how to execute economic development best practice effectively. May present innovative solutions to needs reflected in ED priorities. Project description presents a highly persuasive case for investment through exceptional quality of evidence, use of data and analysis to demonstrate how project supports City's competitiveness at a greater than local level.</p>

Exhibit B

TABLE. ED FUNDING PRIORITIIY ALLOCATION

FY 22 & FY 23 FUNDING ESTIMATE

\$205,000

CATEGORY	PERCENT	AMOUNT
ED Project & Financial Applications	20.0%	41,000
Small Business Development	35.0%	71,750
ED Marketing Services	15.0%	30,750
Entrepreneurs & Startups	30.0%	61,500
TOTAL	100.0%	\$205,000