

SCORING RUBRIC

Scoring Rubric

The same scoring rubric will be used to assess each application. Each of the three 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 120: 40 total points per reviewer x 3 reviewers = 120 points.

#1	PROJECT SUMMARY		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	5	An exceptional project description includes the following features: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project description is detailed and clearly articulates the specific capacity-building opportunity(ies) the organization is seeking. Includes information about how this capacity-building opportunity(ies) was/were identified. How the project will strengthen your organization. For example, improving impact, efficiency, and/or effectiveness. 	5
	4	The project description is somewhat vague or not clearly articulated. The description may be missing one of the features mentioned above.	
	3		
Poor	2	The project description is either missing or does not provide enough information about two or more features mentioned in the "exceptional" ranking.	
	1		

#2	RACIAL EQUITY ALIGNMENT		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	5	Racial equity is clearly embedded as a core value of the organization and is operationalized through the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear FHSP mission alignment. Priority population: Serving zip codes 33705, 33711, and/or 33712. Office locating in 33705, 33711, 33712 zip codes. Organizational leadership (including Board and C-Suite) is largely BIPOC. History of trustful experience working with target population. Lived experience is strongly valued and shapes the project. 	5
	4	Racial equity is valued and strongly articulated in the proposal and considered to be important for serving/working with the project population. Most elements of racial equity are clearly explained or operationalized. Examples of lacking components could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office not in zip code(s) 33705, 33711, or 33712. Organizational leadership is not diverse. No strong history of establishing trusting relationships in the communities served. No clear evidence of how lived experience influences the project. 	
	3		
Poor	2	Racial equity elements are either not included or are not described in detail. Racial equity is appreciated but not clearly articulated.	
	1		

SCORING RUBRIC

#3 CAPACITY-BUILDING SESSIONS				MAX POINTS
The proposal outlines which four workshops a member(s) of the organization will attend and clearly articulates the connection between their engagement in each workshop and the benefit to their capacity-building efforts/project goals.				20
	<p>Completely met (5 Points)</p> <p>The rationale for attending a workshop links workshop content to the unique capacity-building opportunities of the organization and goal(s) of the project in a clear and realistic way.</p>	<p>Somewhat met (3 points)</p> <p>The rationale for attending a workshop was not provided or the link between the workshop content and unique capacity-building opportunities/goals of project was somewhat clear or realistic.</p>	<p>Not met (0 Points)</p> <p>The rationale for attending a workshop was not provided and the link between the workshop content and unique capacity-building opportunities/goals of project was not clear or realistic.</p>	
Workshop # 1				
Workshop # 2				
Workshop # 3				
Workshop # 4				

#4 IMPACT METRIC(S)			MAX POINTS
Exceptional	5	Project goal is clearly stated and includes all of the following: project outcome(s), how the outcome(s) will be measured, and explicitly communicates which specific type of capacity-building the organization will be focused on (human, organizational, structural, or material*). *Definitions for types of capacity-building can be found in the application instructions (under the section titled "Impact")	5
Good	4	Project goal is mostly clear and specific type of capacity-building (human, organizational, structural, material) focus is identified.	
	3	However, project outcome(s) and/or measurement of outcome(s) may be vague/unclear.	
Poor	2	Project goal is not clear or specific type of capacity-building (human, organizational, structural, material) focus is not explicitly stated.	
	1	Project outcome(s) and/or measurement of outcome(s) may be missing.	

SCORING RUBRIC

#5	BUDGET JUSTIFICATION		MAX POINTS
Exceptional	5	<p>Funding aligns perfectly with needs and goals (total amount requested 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.</p> <p>In addition, no unallowable expenses including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles/transportation • Capital expenditures: renovations, property upgrades or purchases, rent, etc. 	5
	4	<p>Budget somewhat aligns with needs and goals (total mostly makes sense) and a good justification for overall project. Some elements presented may be vague, including budget narrative or justification for a certain expense.</p>	
Good	3		
Poor	2	<p>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).missing.</p>	
	1		