

APPENDIX 3

Scoring Rubric

The same scoring rubric will be used to assess each application. Each of the five reviewers will review and score every grant application. The cumulative total of the reviewers' scores will be used to inform funding decisions. The highest score an applicant may receive is 500: 100 total points per reviewer x 5 reviewers = 500 points.

#1	PROJECT DESCRIPTION		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	The rationale for the proposed project is thoroughly presented, the description flows extremely well, and the alignment with focus area(s) is clear. Features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough articulation and connection to how FHSP research scan(s) and CHNA inform the project. 	10
	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solution responds to opportunities presented in the community. Clear short-term benefits for the target population. Potential for long-term sustainable impact is highly likely. The project description has a clear and cohesive flow. 	
Strong	8	The rationale for the proposed project is strong, flows well, and the project aligns well with the focus area(s). Features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description includes some information about how the project is connected to or informed by the FHSP research scan(s) and CHNA. 	
	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of short-term benefits for the target population are mostly clear. Potential for long-term sustainable impact appears achievable. 	
Good	6	Sound articulation of the proposed project that clearly states a need and/or opportunity present within the community, but the connection to FHSP research scans and CHNA is vague.	
	5	Short-term benefits and long-term sustainable impact may not be fully achievable.	
Fair	4	Weak articulation of the proposed project (too specific or too broad). The need and/or opportunity the project addresses is generally stated but the connection to the FHSP research scans and CHNA is missing .	
	3	The outcomes are unlikely to be achieved in the project's current form.	
Poor	2	Poor articulation of the proposed program. No clear focus area alignment. Scan research and CHNA are not used as rationale for proposed program.	
	1	The solution presented is not in response to community opportunities or needs. No short-term benefits were identified and no possibility of long-term impact.	

APPENDIX 3

#2	RACIAL EQUITY		MAX POINTS	
Exceptional	10	Racial equity is clearly embedded as a core value for the project and operationalized through the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear FHSP mission alignment. • Target population: zip codes that include South St. Pete CRA and primarily BIPOC. • Cultural responsiveness framework guides the organization and project's goals. 	10	
	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong acknowledgment of diversity in service models. • Organizational leadership (including Board and C-Suite) is largely BIPOC. • Clear understanding that the community served is not a monolith and cultural experiences may differ. • History of trustful experience working with target population. • Lived experience is strongly valued and shapes the project. 		
Strong	8	Racial equity is valued and strongly articulated in the program proposal and considered to be important for serving/working with the project population. Most elements of racial equity are clearly explained or operationalized.		
	7			
Good	6	Racial equity is included and articulated in the program proposal but lacks at least two elements necessary for a strong proposal. Examples of lacking components could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No strong articulation of a culturally responsive framework in the project. 		
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service model is the same across different populations. • Organizational leadership is not diverse. • No strong history of establishing trusting relationships in the communities serve. • No clear evidence of how lived experience influences the project. 		
Fair	4	Racial equity is appreciated but not clearly articulated in the project proposal. No strong understanding of how to incorporate racial equity into project proposal.		
	3			
Poor	2	Racial equity elements are either not included or are not a part of the program proposal. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not aligned with FHSP mission. • Target population not in the zip codes that include South St. Petersburg CRA nor BIPOC. • No clear understanding of cultural responsiveness. 		
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan is to serve all clients using same service delivery model, programming, relationship building techniques, etc. • Organizational leadership not diverse at all levels. • Community treated as a monolith. • No history of interaction with target population. • No inclusion of lived experience voices in shaping proposed project. 		

APPENDIX 3

#3	OPERATIONAL READINESS AND COLLABORATION		MAX POINTS	
Exceptional	10	<p>The proposed project demonstrates exceptional operational readiness and collaboration(s) that support an extremely high likelihood of project completion during the grant period.</p> <p>As evidenced by the following examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive and extremely feasible timeline that shows project completion during the grant period (No/very little foreseeable adjustments needed). Compelling proposal that includes committed collaboration that aligns with project impact. FULL capacity to complete project as indicated by 1) clear roles for project staff, 2) right people with the right experience for those roles. Appropriateness of multiple sectors involvement (non-profit, government, religious org., etc.). 	10	
	9			
Strong	8	The proposed project demonstrates strong operational readiness and collaboration that mostly support a high likelihood of project completion during the grant period. However, one aspect of operational readiness may be unclear or vague.		
	7			
Good	6	The proposal includes good operational readiness and collaboration that somewhat supports the likelihood of project completion during the grant period. However, two aspects of operational readiness may be unclear, vague, non-realistic, or missing.		
	5			
Fair	4	The proposed project demonstrates fair operational readiness and collaboration that minimally supports the likelihood of project completion during the grant period. However, three aspects of operational readiness may be unclear, vague, non-realistic, or missing.		
	3			
Poor	2	The proposed project demonstrates poor operational readiness and collaboration that do not support timely project completion. Four or more aspects are unclear, vague, non-realistic, or missing.		
	1			

APPENDIX 3

#4A	UNIVERSAL IMPACT METRIC: SYSTEMS CHANGE		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	Objective presented follows SMART guidelines and fulfills all 5 SMART characteristics. S - Specific What will be accomplished? What actions will you take? M - Measurable What data will measure the goal? (How much? How well?	10
	9	A - Achievable Is the goal doable? Do you have the necessary skills and resources? R - Relevant How does the goal align with broader goals? Why is the result important? T - Time-Bound What is the time frame for accomplishing the goal?	
Strong	8	Objective presented mostly follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 4 SMART characteristics.	
	7		
Good	6	Objective presented somewhat follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 3 SMART characteristics.	
	5		
Fair	4	Objective presented minimally follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 2 SMART characteristics.	
	3		
Poor	2	Objective not articulated or the objective does not follow SMART guidelines.	
	1		

#4B	UNIVERSAL IMPACT METRICS: CHNA		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	Objective presented follows SMART guidelines and fulfills all 5 SMART characteristics. S - Specific What will be accomplished? What actions will you take? M - Measurable What data will measure the goal? (How much? How well?	10
	9	A - Achievable Is the goal doable? Do you have the necessary skills and resources? R - Relevant How does the goal align with broader goals? Why is the result important? T - Time-Bound What is the time frame for accomplishing the goal?	
Strong	8	Objective presented mostly follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 4 SMART characteristics.	
	7		
Good	6	Objective presented somewhat follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 3 SMART characteristics.	
	5		
Fair	4	Objective presented minimally follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 2 SMART characteristics.	
	3		
Poor	2	Objective not articulated or the objective does not follow SMART guidelines.	
	1		

APPENDIX 3

#4C	UNIQUE IMPACT : COMMUNITY CAPITAL OR ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	Objective presented follows SMART guidelines and fulfills all 5 SMART characteristics. S - Specific What will be accomplished? What actions will you take? M - Measurable What data will measure the goal? (How much? How well?)	10
	9	A - Achievable Is the goal doable? Do you have the necessary skills and resources? R - Relevant How does the goal align with broader goals? Why is the result important? T - Time-Bound What is the time frame for accomplishing the goal?	
Strong	8	Objective presented mostly follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 4 SMART characteristics.	
	7		
Good	6	Objective presented somewhat follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 3 SMART characteristics.	
	5		
Fair	4	Objective presented minimally follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 2 SMART characteristics.	
	3		
Poor	2	Objective not articulated or the objective does not follow SMART guidelines.	
	1		

#4D	UNIQUE IMPACT METRICS: PATHWAY CONNECTIONS		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	Objective presented follows SMART guidelines and fulfills all 5 SMART characteristics. S - Specific What will be accomplished? What actions will you take? M - Measurable What data will measure the goal? (How much? How well?)	10
	9	A - Achievable Is the goal doable? Do you have the necessary skills and resources? R - Relevant How does the goal align with broader goals? Why is the result important? T - Time-Bound What is the time frame for accomplishing the goal?	
Strong	8	Objective presented mostly follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 4 SMART characteristics.	
	7		
Good	6	Objective presented somewhat follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 3 SMART characteristics.	
	5		
Fair	4	Objective presented minimally follows SMART guidelines but may only fulfill 2 SMART characteristics.	
	3		
Poor	2	Objective not articulated or the objective does not follow SMART guidelines.	
	1		

APPENDIX 3

#5	EVALUATION		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	The proposal includes a thorough articulation of anticipated results/success and includes a robust description of data and methods. Examples of details in a strong evaluation, data, and monitoring plan are:	10
	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection plan • How will progress be measured? • Who will collect data? • How will data be collected? • Are feedback loops included? 	
Strong	8	The proposal includes a strong articulation of anticipated results/success, but the plan lacks one or two minor details about data or methods. Strong likelihood of timely project completion.	
	7		
Good	6	The proposal includes a good articulation of results/success but is missing more than two important details about data methods. Good likelihood of timely project completion.	
	5		
Fair	4	The success of the program is difficult to determine or is flawed by unmeasurable outcomes, inappropriate methods, or lack of useful data collection. Fair likelihood of timely project completion.	
	3		
Poor	2	The evaluation plan is missing or unusable . Timely project completion is unlikely .	
	1		

APPENDIX 3

#6	SUSTAINABILITY		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	<p>Ample evidence (3+) is presented that the program or its impact can be sustained locally, beyond the grant period (if evaluation results warrant).</p> <p>Evidence of sustainability can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a new revenue stream • Teaching/knowledge capital (i.e., people carry it with them, valuable contributions to research or informs decision making • Strategies to maintain collaboration(s) • Contributes to internal policies/practices that advance racial equity • Data systems continue • New mental models (i.e., new ways of thinking) are promoted in community spaces 	10
	9		
Strong	8	The proposal provides at least two pieces of evidence that the program or its impact can be sustained locally, beyond the grant period.	
	7		
Good	6	One piece of evidence is presented that the program or its impact can be sustained locally, beyond the grant period.	
	5		
Fair	4	Plans for the future are stated as assumptions without supporting arguments/evidence.	
	3		
Poor	2	No meaningful plan is presented that the program or its impact can be sustained locally, beyond the grant period.	
	1		

APPENDIX 3

#7	BUDGET JUSTIFICATION		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	10	Funding aligns perfectly with needs and goals (total makes sense) and an exceptional justification for overall project. There is clear alignment with the activities, personnel, and requests. Collaborative partnerships are included and match the budget when there is a collaborative need for funding. No line items in the budget seem excessive.	10
	9	In addition, applicant did not ask for any unallowable expenses including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal agent fee is no more than 10% • Funding for a separate evaluation no more than 15% • No political activity 	
Strong	8	Budget mostly aligns with needs and goals (total mostly makes sense) and a strong justification for overall project. May be vague on one or two elements presented, including budget narrative or justification for a certain expense.	
	7		
Good	6	Budget somewhat aligns with needs and goals (total mostly makes sense) and a good justification for overall project. May be vague on three or four elements presented, including budget narrative or justification for a certain expense.	
	5		
Fair	4	Budget minimally aligns with needs and goals (total mostly makes sense) and a fair justification for overall project. May be vague on 5 or more elements presented, including budget narrative or justification for a certain expense.	
	3		
Poor	2	No budget submitted or major components of the budget are missing (i.e., line item estimates, overall total, etc) or there are major gaps in the budget that indicate poor planning (i.e., extremely high or low estimates).	
	1		