The Weld Trust - Grant Application Scoring Rubric

Having reached the RFP process, there is an assumed fit with The Weld Trust Strategic Initiatives being considered this cycle

Applicant _____

Evaluator _____

	3.76 - 5	2.51 - 3.75	1.26 - 2.5	0 - 1.25	Score	Weight	Total
1. Need (clearly documented institutional or community need)	Empirical evidence strongly supports need for the activities proposed in this grant.	Need exists in most but not all areas addressed by grant.	Only partial evidence exists that there is a true need.	No or weak evidence exists that grant would address a demonstrated need.	5	2	10
2. Project Purpose/Goals	Goals for the project are clearly defined/described and relate strongly or directly to the need or issue they are trying to help with.	Project's purpose is stated.	Project's purpose is unclear or does not address stated The Weld Trust stated funding priorities.*	Project Purpose/Goals are not stated.	5	2.4	12
3. Population Served (scope and magnitude of grant or; ability to affect change with targeted population)	Sufficiently large or underserved population to result in meaningful benefits to the targeted population and overall community; population targeted to achieve specific purpose/goals.	Meaningful benefits to community, but the population served is either small in scope or difficult to differentiate impact on underserved from general population..	Unclear whether population affected would result in meaningful benefit to community; additional information required	Population affected by grant insufficient to justify time/energy invested in developing proposal.	5	1.8	9
4. Alignment with The Weld Trust Initiative and Program Areas	Directly on point and strongly aligned with The Weld Trust Initiative.	Mostly aligned with what The Weld Trust is trying to accomplish.	Only partially or tangentially aligned with the goals and objectives of The Weld Trust.	No or very weak alignment.	5	2.4	12
5. Project Evaluation and Outcomes	Proposal includes a variety of methods to assess participants and evaluate the project and those assessments relate directly to the project purpose/goals.	Proposal includes a variety of methods to assess participants and evaluate the project but it is unclear how those assessments relate to the project purpose/goals.	Proposal includes at least one method to assess participants or evaluate the project.	Proposal does not include any methods to assess participants or evaluate the project.	5	2.4	12
6. Demonstrated Results (Does the program or project have prior demonstrated results? Over multiple years? Or, if the program or project is new, does it demonstrate innovation or high promise for success?)	Program or project demonstrates strong prior results over multiple years. Continued support will likely lead to similar results; expansion of the program or project is warranted. If new, program or project is highly innovative with anticipated results drawn on evidence-based experience with similar programs.	Program or project shows prior results but not over multiple years. Results were positive, but have not been sustained over time. If new, innovation is marginal and likelihood of success is not clearly demonstrated by similar programs	Prior results are vague and not clearly linked to project purpose/goals. Innovation is weak, and there is not sufficient evidence provided to link success to similar programs.	Prior results are not stated and not linked to current project or program. If new, no accompanying evidence is provided citing success in similar programs or projects and/or no innovative characteristics demonstrated in request.	5	1.8	9
7. Impact/Anticipated Results- Ask What will Change as a Result of This Project	Program addresses root causes and not merely symptoms of systemic community problems. Successful implementation leads to changes in societal conditions as well as individual lives. Project is transformational in nature, addressing systemic issues of the community.	Project serves a broad number of clients and community members. Successful implementation leads to changes in individual lives.	Project funding is transactional in nature. Impact revolves around the institution and its needs only.	Impact is negligible or absent.	5	2.4	12
8. Collaboration	Proposal takes into consideration systemic or big-picture needs and includes other stakeholders needed to fulfill goals, each of which add value to the program.	Proposal shows some level of collaboration with essential partners, but not all.	Critical project partner is missing from the project plans or at least one collaborative partner's contribution to the project is unclear.	No collaboration stated.	5	1.2	6
9. Expertise and Credentials of Proposed Project Director and Grant Personnel	Projector Director and personnel possess high-level of grant-related expertise. We have great confidence that this project will be implemented effectively.	Agency personnel possess most but not all grant-required expertise; some training needed.	Agency lacks expertise in most grant-related areas; difficulties exist in identifying content experts.	Agency personnel lack expertise to successfully manage this grant opportunity.	5	1.2	6
10. Sustainability (Plan Exists to Sustain Post- Grant Activities)	Clear funding plan exists for all activities after grant award period ends; plan likely sustainable beyond grant period without additional philanthropic support.	Most grant activities supported post-award do not require post-award funding, but some activities may require additional funding from philanthropic sources.	Some aspects of grant will be sustained post-award, but most activities will likely require additional funding from philanthropic sources.	No plan for post-award activities; plan is not sustainable absent this funding.	5	1.2	6
11. Budget and Financial Stability	Budget is complete and contains all required information. Budget is cost effective and linked to activities and outcomes. Organization is financially stable.	Budget is complete but costs are high and/or not directly related to outcomes acheived.	Budget lacks required information or spending does not align with the project purpose/goals.	No budget included or is not pertinent.	5	1.2	6
TOTAL (100 possible)							100.00

	Yes	No
Letter of support from Organization Leadership		

Staff Recommended Funding

Fund at lower amount - conditional

Reviewer Notes: