

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE

CITIZENS' COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN

CITIZENS' REVIEW PANEL FOR HUMAN SERVICES (CRPHS) ADVISORY BOARD REVIEWER ASSIGNMENT, REVIEWER PARTICIPATION, AND SCORE TABULATION

Standard Operating Procedure No.	CRPHS 1.0
Original Date of Issue:	7/10/2026
Revision Date:	
Revised By:	
Approved By :	Citizens' Commission for Children Advisory Board

Purpose

The purpose of this Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is to formalize the consistent and transparent process for assigning reviewers, documenting reviewer participation, managing conflicts of interest, and tabulating application scores for the Citizens' Review Panel for Human Services Advisory Board (CRPHS) Fund Distribution Process.

This SOP is intended to ensure that all eligible and valid reviewer scores are included in the final score calculation, while also establishing a minimum reviewer threshold necessary to support reliable score tabulation. The procedure further ensures that missing scores, conflicts of interest, incomplete reviews, and other scoring exceptions are documented and addressed in a uniform manner.

This SOP supports the Citizens' Commission for Children (CCC) Advisory Board's Normalized Index Scoring Method, adopted on February 13, 2026, and provides staff with the procedural framework necessary to apply the scoring methodology consistently across all applications reviewed during the CRPHS competitive funding process.

Monitoring Components	
1.0	Scope
2.0	Definitions
3.0	Authority and Governance
4.0	Board Composition and Review Panel Structure
5.0	Roles and Responsibilities
6.0	Reviewer Assignment Procedure
7.0	Conflict- of- Interest Procedure
8.0	Review Process
9.0	Score Status Designation
10.0	Minimum Reviewer Threshold
11.0	Score Tabulation Procedure

1.0 SCOPE

This SOP applies to all competitive funding application reviews conducted through the CRPHS Fund Distribution process, including:

- CRPHS Advisory Board members assigned to serve as voting reviewers;
- Members in Training participating in orientation, observation, or training activities;
- Board Chair and/or Vice Chair, or their designee, when serving in an alternate reviewer capacity;
- County staff responsible for coordinating and documenting the review process, and/or participating in tabulating and presenting application scores; and
- All applications reviewed and scored as part of the competitive funding solicitation process.

This SOP does not supersede applicable public meeting requirements, conflict-of-interest requirements, or Board-approved scoring methodologies. In the event of a conflict between this SOP and any legal requirement, the legal requirement shall govern.

Exclusion – Mini Grant Fund Distribution Process: This SOP applies exclusively to the Citizens' Review Panel for Human Services (CRPHS) Fund Distribution Process. It does not apply to the Citizens' Commission for Children (CCC) Mini Grant Fund Distribution Process, which is administered separately and is subject to its own applicable procedures and requirements.

2.0 DEFINITIONS

For purposes of this SOP, the following definitions shall apply:

Alternate Reviewer: A qualified voting member assigned to complete an application review when an assigned reviewer is unable to participate due to a conflict of interest, absence, non-submission, incomplete review, or another approved reason.

Assigned Reviewer: A reviewer assigned to a specific review panel and responsible for reviewing and scoring applications assigned to that panel.

Conflict of Interest: A relationship, interest, affiliation, or circumstance that may compromise, or appear to compromise, a reviewer's ability to objectively evaluate an application. Public board members are prohibited from voting on measures that provide a special private gain or loss to themselves, their relatives, business associates, or the principals they represent. A reviewer with a conflict of interest shall not score the affected application.

COI: A scoring designation used to indicate that a reviewer did not score an application due to a conflict of interest.

Incomplete Score: The score submission that is missing required section scores, contains unresolved scoring errors, or is otherwise insufficient to be included in score tabulation.

Member-at-Large: An appointed Board member eligible to participate as a voting reviewer when assigned to a review panel or otherwise authorized to complete an application review.

Member in Training: An individual participating in Board training or observation activities who has not been appointed as a voting Board member or Member-at-Large.

No Score Submitted: A designation used when an assigned reviewer fails to submit a complete score by the established deadline.

NSS: The abbreviation for No Score Submitted.

NULL: A designation used when a score is removed from tabulation for an approved administrative reason. Reasons may include, but are not limited to, conflict of interest, duplicate score entry, incomplete score submission, inconsistent scoring entry, system error, or other documented scoring irregularity. NULL scores shall not be included in final score calculations.

Index Scoring Method: A scoring methodology used to calculate a final application score based on section averages derived from valid reviewer scores.

Valid Score: A complete score submitted by an assigned voting reviewer who is eligible to score the application and does not have a conflict of interest.

Voting Reviewer: A CRPHS Advisory Board member or Member-at-Large assigned and authorized to evaluate and score applications.

3.0 AUTHORITY AND GOVERNANCE

The CRPHS Advisory Board is responsible for reviewing applications and making funding recommendations in accordance with the established fund distribution process.

County staff are responsible for administering the review process, coordinating reviewer assignments, maintaining official records, documenting reviewer participation, and completing score tabulation in accordance with the Board-approved scoring methodology.

The Board's adopted Normalized Index Scoring Method shall be used to calculate final application scores unless otherwise modified or replaced through a process approved by the Board, Division Manager, or Community and Family Services Department (CFS) Statistician.

4.0 BOARD COMPOSITION AND REVIEW PANEL STRUCTURE

The CRPHS Advisory Board consists of twenty-four (24) appointed members. For purposes of application review, the Board is organized into four (4) review panels. Each review panel is assigned voting members who are responsible for reviewing and scoring applications assigned to that panel.

Panel assignments shall be established prior to the start of the review cycle. To the extent practical, panel assignments should remain consistent throughout the review process in order to promote continuity, fairness, and consistency in the evaluation of applications.

4.1 Members in Training

The CRPHS Advisory Board may include Members in Training who participate in orientation, onboarding, training, and observation activities related to the Board's responsibilities.

Members in Training may:

- Attend Board meetings, orientations, and training sessions;
- Observe panel review sessions, as permitted;
- Receive training on application review procedures, scoring rubrics, and Board responsibilities;
- Participate in non-voting learning activities; and
- Prepare for potential future appointment as a voting member.

Members in Training shall not:

- Serve as voting reviewers;
- Be included in final score tabulations;
- Be counted toward the minimum reviewer threshold;
- Replace an absent voting reviewer unless formally appointed as a Member-at-Large; or
- Participate in actions reserved for appointed voting members.

When Board membership falls below the authorized complement of twenty voting members, a Member in Training may be appointed as a Member-at-Large in accordance with Orange County's Agenda Development procedures. The individual then becomes eligible to serve as a voting reviewer and may be assigned to review and score applications.

5.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1 County Staff

County staff are responsible for administering the review and score tabulation process. Staff responsibilities include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing reviewer panel assignments;
- Maintaining the official reviewer roster;
- Assigning applications to the appropriate review panels;
- Coordinating reviewer access to applications and scoring materials;
- Providing scoring instructions, deadlines, and technical support;
- Documenting reviewer participation;
- Tracking missing, incomplete, conflicted, or excluded scores;
- Assigning or coordinating alternate reviewers when necessary;
- Calculating section averages and final application scores;
- Applying the approved Index Scoring Method;
- Completing quality assurance review of score calculations;
- Maintaining official scoring documentation; and
- Preparing scores for presentation, reconciliation, and/or Board consideration.

Staff shall not alter reviewer scores except to remove or exclude scores in accordance with documented administrative procedures.

5.2 Voting Reviewers

Voting reviewers are responsible for independently reviewing and scoring assigned applications in accordance with the approved scoring rubric. Voting reviewers shall:

- Adhere to all applicable laws (i.e. Sunshine Law, Public Records, Voting Conflict, etc.)
- Review each assigned application thoroughly;
- Utilize the scoring rubric as a guide;
- Submit complete scores by the established deadline;
- Disclose conflicts of interest immediately, and refrain from scoring applications for which a conflict exists;
- Maintain the confidentiality and integrity of the review process; and
- Participate in review discussions in accordance with Board procedures.

Voting reviewers shall not assign scores on behalf of another reviewer or modify scores after submission unless permitted through an approved correction process.

5.3 Board Chair and Vice Chair

The Board Chair and/or Vice-Chair, or their designee, may serve as alternate reviewers when necessary to meet the minimum reviewer threshold, provided they are eligible to score the application and have no conflict of interest.

When serving as alternate reviewers, the Chair and/or Vice-Chair or their designee shall follow the same review requirements applicable to all voting reviewers.

The assignment of the Board Chair and/or Vice-Chair, and/or their designee, as an alternate reviewer shall be documented by County Staff.

5.4 Members in Training

Members in Training may participate in orientation, training, and observation activities but shall not serve as voting reviewers unless formally appointed as voting members or Members-at-Large in accordance with Orange County procedures.

6.0 REVIEWER ASSIGNMENT PROCEDURE

Prior to the beginning of each review cycle, staff shall complete the following actions:

1. Confirm the current roster of appointed Board members and Members-at-Large;
2. Identify members eligible to serve as voting reviewers;
3. Establish review panel assignments;
4. Document the voting members assigned to each review panel;
5. Assign applications to the appropriate review panels;
6. Identify known conflicts of interest, when available;
7. Provide reviewers with applicable scoring rubrics, review instructions, deadlines, and access information;
8. Confirm whether alternate reviewers may be needed due to known absences, vacancies, or conflicts; and
9. Maintain an official reviewer assignment record for the review cycle.

Panel assignments should remain consistent throughout the funding cycle whenever practical. If reviewer assignments must be changed, staff shall document the reason for the change.

7.0 CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST PROCEDURE

When a conflict of interest is identified:

1. The assigned panel member shall notify staff immediately and complete the designated Conflict of Interest form;
2. Staff shall maintain the form that discloses the conflict;
3. The assigned panel member shall not score the affected application or any other applications within the associated funding objective;
4. The score field shall be marked as COI, as applicable;
5. The conflicted assigned panel member shall be excluded from score tabulation for that application and any other application within the funding objective.
6. Staff shall determine whether an alternate reviewer is required to meet the minimum reviewer threshold.

7. The assigned panel member will abstain from voting on matters pertaining to the affected agency, and complete FORM 8B, Memorandum of Voting Conflict for County, Municipal, and Other Local Public Officers.

8.0 REVIEW PROCESS

Assigned voting reviewers shall independently review each assigned application and complete the County-approved scoring rubric. The rubric shall be used to promote a fair, consistent, and objective evaluation of all applications. While reviewers may exercise professional judgement, any recommendation shall be supported by the evaluation criteria reflected in the rubric.

Following the submission deadline, staff may contact reviewers who have not submitted scores to determine whether the evaluations can be completed before score tabulation begins. Any post-deadline scores accepted shall be received before the start of score tabulation.

9.0 SCORE STATUS DESIGNATIONS

Staff shall use standardized score status designations to document reviewer participation and score eligibility. Only valid scores shall be included in the calculation of section averages and final application scores.

Status	Meaning	Included in Tabulation
Valid Score	Complete score submitted by an eligible voting reviewer with no conflict of interest	Yes
COI	Reviewer did not score due to a conflict of interest	No
MIT	Member in Training – Score not Eligible	No
NSS	Assigned reviewer did not submit a complete score by the deadline	No
NULL	Score removed from tabulation due to administrative reason, conflict, error, duplicate entry, incomplete score, or scoring irregularity	No

10.0 MINIMUM REVIEWER THRESHOLD

A minimum of three valid reviewer scores is required in order to calculate a final application score.

The minimum threshold is intended to ensure that final scores are based on sufficient reviewer input and are not disproportionately influenced by one or two reviewers.

All valid reviewer scores shall be used when calculating final application scores. Scores shall not be reduced to a fixed number of reviewers when more than three valid scores are available.

11.0 SCORE TABULATION PROCEDURE

After the score submission deadline has passed, staff shall complete the following steps for each application.

1. **Verify Reviewer Assignment:** Staff shall confirm that the application was assigned to the appropriate review panel and that the reviewers listed for the application match the official reviewer roster.
2. **Verify Reviewer Participation:** Staff shall determine the participation status of each assigned reviewer.
3. **Identify Valid and Invalid Scores:** Staff shall review all submitted scores and determine whether each score is valid for tabulation.
4. **Apply Reviewer Threshold Requirements:** Staff shall apply the following threshold requirements before calculating a final application score.

Valid Scores Received	Required Action
All assigned valid reviewer scores received	Use all valid scores.
Four valid scores received	Use all four valid scores and document any missing, conflicted, or excluded reviewer score.
Three valid scores received	Use all three valid scores and document that the minimum reviewer threshold was met.
Fewer than three valid scores received	Do not calculate a final application score. Assign an alternate reviewer or schedule a re-review in accordance with Board procedures.

If fewer than three valid scores are available, staff shall not estimate, substitute, or otherwise create a score. Corrective action must occur before a final score may be calculated.

5. **Assign an Alternate Reviewer, if Required:** If an application receives fewer than three valid reviewer scores, staff shall determine whether an alternate reviewer is available.

The Chair and/or Vice-Chair, or their designee, may serve as alternate reviewers, when necessary, provided they are eligible, available, and have no conflict of interest.

Alternate reviewer assignments shall be documented and shall include:

- Name of alternate reviewer;
- Reason alternate reviewer was assigned;
- Application(s) reviewed;
- Date of assignment;
- Date score was submitted; and
- Staff member documenting the assignment.

- 6. Calculate Section Averages:** Once the minimum reviewer threshold has been met, staff shall calculate the average score for each scoring section. Section averages shall be calculated using only valid reviewer scores.

Scores marked COI, NSS, NULL, incomplete, or otherwise invalid shall not be included in section average calculations.

Missing scores shall not be estimated, averaged, substituted, or imputed.

- 7. Apply the Normalized Index Scoring Method:** After section averages are calculated, staff shall apply the Board-approved Normalized Index Scoring Method.

- Agency Application Index = $((\bar{A} \div 22) + (\bar{B} \div 10) + (\bar{C} \div 3)) \div 3 \times 35$
- Program Application Index = $((\bar{A} \div 50) + (\bar{B} \div 5) + (\bar{C} \div 10)) \div 3 \times 65$

Where:

$\bar{A}$ = Average score for Section A

$\bar{B}$ = Average score for Section B

$\bar{C}$ = Average score for Section C

- 8. Review Score Outputs:** After the final application score is calculated, staff shall review the score output for accuracy.
- 9. Conduct Quality Assurance Review:** Before scores are finalized, a quality assurance review shall be completed.

Any discrepancy identified during the quality assurance review shall be resolved before scores are released, presented, or used for funding recommendation purposes.

Final scores may be used to support funding recommendations only after completion of the required review and verification process.