

<b>YVCF Community Grant Cycle - 2023 Scoring Rubric</b>				
Score: 9-10 (Excellent)	Score 7-8 (Above Average)	Score 5-6 (Average)	Score 3-4 (Below Average)	Score 0-2 (Unsatisfactory)
<b>Questions 12a-12c. Program Grant Requests ONLY</b>				
<b>12a-12c. Description of program is ...</b>				
...excellent: clear and compelling on the who, what, when, where, how, and why of the program.	...above average, e.g., clear but may lack evidence.	...average, e.g., can be understood but lacks detail.	...below average, e.g., can be understood but lacks detail and evidence.	...omitted; missing details that would be required to understand or assess the program.
<b>12a(i)-12a(ii). Identification of a community need is ...</b>				
...clearly identified along with the intended audience served (with compelling evidence for both).	...above average, e.g., need and audience are identified with some evidence.	...average, e.g., need and/or audience may be unclear or unconnected.	...below average, e.g., need or audience may be omitted or too small/niche to justify funding.	...omitted or offered without evidence.
<b>12a(iii)-12a(v). Alignment between the approach and goals is ...</b>				
...logical and compelling: connects needs to audience served to goals to methods to outcomes.	...above average, e.g., chosen approach is a logical path toward goals.	...average, e.g., there may be weak evidence for how methods will achieve goals.	...below average, e.g., not clearly explained; no evidence.	...absent; there is no logical alignment between approach and program goals.
<b>12b. Program budget is ...</b>				
...clear, detailed, and compelling in its potential to achieve program goals. Applicant considered other funding sources and expected revenues seem achievable. Long-term or pilot programs seem sustainable.	...above average, e.g., it's reasonable that program will be viable. Considered other revenue streams.	...average, e.g., may lack detail or raise concerns. May not have considered other funding sources.	...below average, e.g., raises concern or confusion on key details. Might have few or no other funding sources.	...insufficient: too unclear to decipher or too unlikely to achieve program goals.

<b>YVCF Community Grant Cycle - 2023 Scoring Rubric</b>				
Score: 9-10 (Excellent)	Score 7-8 (Above Average)	Score 5-6 (Average)	Score 3-4 (Below Average)	Score 0-2 (Unsatisfactory)
<b>Questions 13-16. Leadership</b>				
<b>13-16. Staff and board show ...</b>				
...highly relevant and varied professional careers, diverse lived experience and perspectives, strong engagement with the organization, passion for the mission, ample numbers of people for the work at hand, and succession plans for future viability.	...most of the qualities of excellent leadership, but not all.	...some of the qualities of excellent leadership, but not most.	...weak leadership based on the qualities of excellent leadership.	...significant concerns.
<b>Question 18. Vision &amp; Multi-year Goals</b>				
Clearly and compellingly identifies the organization's unique, unduplicated vision with specific goals identified for at least 3 years in the future.	Mostly achieves criteria for an excellent vision with minor issues of clarity, achievability, or duplicated services.	Achieves some of the criteria for an excellent vision but may be unspecific, unrealistic, and/or not unique.	Lacks several of the criteria for an excellent vision, e.g., vague, overly broad or narrow, unattainable, and/or redundant services.	Vision and goals are unclear or omitted.
<b>Question 19. Qualitative Impact</b>				
<b>19. How the organization makes impact in the community is ...</b>				
...clearly articulated with specific and significant details and compelling examples provided. Impact is very relevant to the efforts this grant would fund.	...identified with some details and adequate supporting examples. Impact is relevant to the efforts this grant would fund.	...explained but may lack details or clarity. Impact may be fairly relevant to the efforts this grant would fund.	...not clearly explained. Few or no details are provided. Impact may be irrelevant to the efforts this grant would fund.	...not provided, completely unclear, or irrelevant to the efforts the grant would fund.
<b>19a-19b. Identification of a community need is ...</b>				
...clearly identified along with the intended audience served (with compelling evidence for both).	...above average, e.g., need and audience are identified with some evidence.	...average, e.g., need and/or audience may be unclear or unconnected.	...below average, e.g., need or audience may be omitted or too small/niche to justify funding.	...omitted or offered without evidence.
<b>19c-19e. Alignment between the approach and goals is ...</b>				
...logical and compelling: connects needs to audience served to goals to methods to outcomes.	...above average, e.g., chosen approach is a logical path toward goals.	...average, e.g., there may be weak evidence for how methods will achieve goals.	...below average, e.g., not clearly explained; no evidence.	...absent; there is no logical alignment between approach and program goals.

<b>YVCF Community Grant Cycle - 2023 Scoring Rubric</b>				
Score: 9-10 (Excellent)	Score 7-8 (Above Average)	Score 5-6 (Average)	Score 3-4 (Below Average)	Score 0-2 (Unsatisfactory)
<b>Question 20. Evaluation and Quantitative Impact</b>				
Organization shows a strong grasp of the measurable impact of their efforts with compelling data to illustrate the past, present, and/or future impact of their work. There is an ongoing commitment to sustaining or improving that impact.	Some data provides evidence that the organization is making (or is poised to make) meaningful impact. Evaluation of programs is evident.	Quantitative data of impact is evident but may not be completely clear or compelling. May not indicate ongoing commitment to evaluating their own work.	Weak evidence that the organization is making a measurable impact. Little or no commitment to evaluation.	No indication of impact or processes of evaluation.
<b>Question 21. Shared Goals and Collaboration</b>				
The organization makes it clear it is working towards a community goal to benefit meaningful numbers* of residents and/or visitors. To achieve this goal, it has formed solid and impactful collaborations (or has a compelling plan to achieve such collaborations).	There is a fairly clear goal to reach meaningful numbers* of people. There is some evidence of collaborations.	There is adequate explanation of a goal to reach meaningful numbers* of people. Evidence of collaborating with other groups may be weak.	The stated goal may not be clear, it may reach a very limited number of people, or it may not be shared by other groups.	There is little or no evidence of a goal shared by others or benefiting meaningful numbers* of people.
*Our interpretation of 'meaningful numbers' considers efficiency or ROI, e.g., an intensive one-on-one human services interaction may cost more and reach fewer people overall than efforts to maintain a mile of trails. Both can be valid efforts with meaningful numbers. Metaphorically, it's not about what sort of juice your organization makes but <i>is the juice worth the squeeze?</i>				
<b>Questions 22-24. Organizational Budget &amp; Financials</b>				
<b>22-24. The organization is</b>				
...exceptional in ALL of the following areas: 1) fiscally solvent with cash reserves sufficient to the operating budget, 2) has clear, concise financial statements, and 3) demonstrates financial stability through diverse funding sources and appropriate levels of overhead.	...sufficient in ALL 3 areas listed to the left.	... sufficient in MOST, but not all areas listed to the left. Budget and financials indicate concern in at least one area.	... sufficient in FEW areas listed to the left. Budget and financials indicate concerns in more than one area or serious concerns in one critical area.	... not sufficient in any of the 3 areas listed to the left.