



Grant Application Scoring Rubric

Category	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
<p>Executive Summary (20 points)</p>	<p>The applicant includes and effectively describes the project’s mission and vision, the specific population the project will serve, the expected benefits to the community, the support for applicant’s project in the community with evidence based proposed methods, approaches and strategies are realistic, reasonable, effective, outcome-oriented.</p> <p><i>(16 – 20 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant includes and describes the project’s mission and vision, the population the project will serve, the expected benefits to the community, the support for applicant’s project in the community with evidence based proposed methods, approaches and strategies are realistic, reasonable, effective, outcome-oriented.</p> <p><i>(11 – 15 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant includes and somewhat describes the project’s mission and vision, the general population the project will serve, the expected benefits to the community, the support for applicant’s project in the community with proposed methods, approaches and strategies are realistic, reasonable, effective, outcome-oriented.</p> <p><i>(6 – 10 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant vaguely describes the project’s mission and vision, the general population the project will serve, the expected benefits to the community, the support for applicant’s project in the community with proposed methods, approaches and strategies are realistic, reasonable, effective, outcome-oriented.</p> <p><i>(0 – 5 points)</i></p>

Category	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
<p>Need & Alignment and Demonstrate (15 points)</p>	<p>The applicant explicitly defines a specific need for the project within the identified community and effectively describes the alignment of that need to one of the Community Focus Areas of the District/Foundation’s Strategic Plan by using convincing data, case studies, interviews, focus group results, media attention, etc.</p> <p><i>(12 – 15 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant identifies a general need within the identified community for the project and describes the alignment of that need to one of the Community Focus Areas of the District/Foundation’s Strategic Plan by using convincing data, case studies, interviews, focus group results, media attention, etc.</p> <p><i>(8 – 11 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant somewhat describes a need for the project that is generally aligned to one of the Community Focus Areas of the District/Foundation’s Strategic Plan by using convincing data, case studies, interviews, focus group results, media attention, etc.</p> <p><i>(4 – 7 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant vaguely describes a need for the project that may be loosely aligned to one of the Community Focus Areas of the District/Foundation’s Strategic Plan by using convincing data, case studies, interviews, focus group results, media attention, etc.</p> <p><i>(0 – 3 points)</i></p>
<p>Goals (15 points)</p>	<p>The applicant has provided SMART goals with an evaluation plan that is fully developed. The SMART goals are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and time-bound, and the evaluation plan will accurately measure the project’s effectiveness.</p> <p><i>(12 – 15 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant has provided SMART goals with an evaluation plan that demonstrates some development. The SMART goals are mostly specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and time-bound, and the evaluation plan will measure some aspects of the project’s effectiveness.</p> <p><i>(8 – 11 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant has provided SMART goals and an evaluation plan. The SMART goals are somewhat specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and time-bound, and the evaluation plan will somewhat measure the project’s effectiveness.</p> <p><i>(4 – 7 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant has provided two goals and an evaluation plan. The goals are not specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and timebound, and the evaluation plan will weakly measure the project’s effectiveness, OR the section is missing either a second goal or discussion of the evaluation plan.</p> <p><i>(0 – 3 points)</i></p>

Category	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
<p>Proposed Evaluation Plan (20 points)</p>	<p>The applicant describes a specific detailed plan of action for evaluation, that includes both qualitative and quantitative assessment of the project that is well-defined with data reporting mechanisms that are clear and transparent. The plan of action is strongly aligned with the project's mission and goals as listed in the Executive Summary and Goals sections.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(16 – 20 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant describes a detailed plan of action for evaluation that includes both qualitative and quantitative assessment of the project that is well-defined with data reporting mechanisms that are clear and transparent. The plan of action is aligned with the project's mission and goals as listed in the Executive Summary and Goals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(11 – 15 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant describes a reasonable plan of action that can be completed during the grant period, involves some identified partners appropriately, and might make the project a reality. The plan of action is somewhat aligned with the project's mission and goals as listed in the Executive Summary and Goals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(6 – 10 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant vaguely describes a plan of action OR the plan of action is unreasonable or unlikely to make the project a reality. The plan of action is not aligned with the Executive Summary or Goals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(0 – 5 points)</i></p>
<p>Applicant Capacity and Infrastructure to Execute proposal (15 points)</p>	<p>The applicant includes concrete examples that strongly demonstrate that the human resource allocation to this project is appropriate (internal staff expertise, use of external consultants, advisory committee, etc.)</p> <p>The applicant strongly demonstrates credibility for this kind of work (strength, name recognition, a history or track record of achievements, related mission and letters of support)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(12 – 15 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant includes concrete examples that demonstrate that the human resource allocation to this project is appropriate (internal staff expertise, use of external consultants, advisory committee, etc.).</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates credibility for this kind of work (strength, name recognition, a history or track record of achievements, related mission and letters of support)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(8 – 11 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant includes examples that somewhat demonstrate the human resource allocation to this project is appropriate (internal staff expertise, use of external consultants, advisory committee, etc.).</p> <p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates credibility for this kind of work (strength, name recognition, a history or track record of achievements, related mission and letters of support)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(4 – 7 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant includes examples that do not demonstrate the human resource allocation to this project is appropriate (internal staff expertise, use of external consultants, advisory committee, etc.).</p> <p>The applicant does not demonstrate credibility for this kind of work (strength, name recognition, a history or track record of achievements, related mission and letters of support)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>(0 – 3 points)</i></p>

Category	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
<p>Organizations Sustainability (10 Points)</p>	<p>The applicant strongly demonstrates that it has a current strategic plan and/or business plan with measurable outcomes. Strong board engagement and governance. The proposed program is identified within the strategic plan.</p> <p><i>(9-10 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant demonstrates that it has a current strategic plan and/or business plan with measurable outcomes Shows Board engagement and governance. Applicant has clearly identified that the program is supported by the strategic plan</p> <p><i>(6-8 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant somewhat demonstrates that it has a strategic plan and/or business plan. Applicant has somewhat identified that the program is tied to the strategic plan.</p> <p><i>(3 – 5 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant has no strategic plan and/or business plan. The program reflects the applicant’s mission.</p> <p><i>(0-2 points)</i></p>
<p>Budget (15 points)</p>	<p>The budget is specific and reasonable, and all items strongly align with the described project. The budget strongly demonstrates financial clarity/value and tells the same story as the proposal narrative. There are no unexplained amounts. The overall value of the project (the relationship of benefits and/or participants to costs) is high. Additional leveraged funding sources and in-kind services are included.</p> <p><i>Staff FTE is identified clearly Budget identifies number of XYZ and how this tie to staff time.</i></p> <p><i>(12 – 15 points)</i></p>	<p>The budget is mostly specific and reasonable, and the items align with the described project. The budget demonstrates financial clarity/value and tells the same story as the proposal narrative. There are no unexplained amounts. The overall value of the project (the relationship of benefits and/or participants to costs) is medium. And/or additional funding sources and/or in-kind services are included.</p> <p><i>(8 – 11 points)</i></p>	<p>The budget is somewhat specific and reasonable, and the items are somewhat aligned with the described project. The budget somewhat demonstrates financial clarity. There are no unexplained amounts. The overall value of the project (the relationship of benefits and/or participants to costs) is low.</p> <p><i>(4 – 7 points)</i></p>	<p>The budget is not specific and/or reasonable, and the items listed do not align with the described project. The budget does not clearly tell the same story as the proposal narrative.</p> <p><i>(0 – 3 points)</i></p>

Category	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
<p>% of Funding Requested – Leveraging of Outside Funds (15 points)</p>	<p>0-50% Budget shows mostly committed funds, in-kind funds for professional services and balance is from proposed funds have been identified and in place</p> <p>(12-15 points)</p>	<p>60-70% Budget shows some committed funds, in-kind funds for professional services and proposed funds making up the majority, have been identified and in place</p> <p>(8-11 points)</p>	<p>70 - 80% Budget shows limited to no committed funds, balance is made up of mostly identified proposed funds</p> <p>(4-7 points)</p>	<p>80-100% Budget shows no committed funds, balance is made up of mostly identified proposed funds or a significant % of program budget is being ask for in the grant</p> <p>(0-3 points)</p>
<p>Fiduciary Compliance and Stability (10 Points)</p>	<p>The applicant strongly demonstrates a financial history that shows a continuous cycle of fiduciary responsibility of the board through unmodified audited financials produced in a timely fashion, positive cash flow at the end of each fiscal year, asset ratio meets required debt load, source of funds for operations and programs are coming from multiple sources and the board reviews financials on a regular basis.</p> <p>(9 – 10 points)</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrates a financial history that shows a continuous cycle of fiduciary responsibility of the board through unmodified audited financials produced in a timely fashion, asset ratio meets required debt load, source of funds for operations and programs are coming from multiple sources and the board reviews financials on a regular basis.</p> <p>(6 – 8 points)</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrates a financial history that shows a continuous cycle of fiduciary responsibility of the board through audited financials produced. A positive cash flow at the end of each fiscal year is not consistent. Source of funds for operations and programs are coming from limited sources and the board reviews financials on a regular basis.</p> <p>(3 – 5 points)</p>	<p>The applicant demonstrates a financial history through audited financials. A positive cash flow at the end of each fiscal year is not consistent. Source of funds for operations and programs are coming from little or no alternative resources.</p> <p>(0 – 2 points)</p>

Category	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
<p>Key Partners/ Collective Impact/Collaboration (10 points)</p>	<p>The applicant strongly demonstrates solid partnerships and collaborative approach with letters of commitment or an MOU that includes a scope of work.</p> <p><i>(9 – 10 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant demonstrates partnerships and collaborative approach with letters of commitment.</p> <p><i>(6 – 8 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant demonstrates partnerships but has not included any letters of commitment.</p> <p><i>(3 – 5 points)</i></p>	<p>The applicant does not demonstrate any partnerships.</p> <p><i>(0 – 2 points)</i></p>
<p><i>Comments/Notes:</i></p>				