

## YVCF Community Grant Cycle - 2025 Scoring Rubric

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 - 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. Audience/Need: Identification of the people served and the charitable need is ...</b>				
...clearly identified with compelling evidence that demonstrates the existence of the audience at a scale significant to justify funding. There is a clear need well aligned with vision and mission of organization. <b>Program grants must explain the audience/need served by the proposed program (not the organization as a whole) and must demonstrate how funds will be tracked specific to that program.</b>	...above average, e.g., identified with some evidence.	...average, e.g., audience or need may be unclear or unconnected to vision/mission.	...below average, e.g., audience and/or need may be omitted or too small/niche to justify funding.	...omitted or offered without evidence.
<b>Question 20. Approach: The tactics, tools, techniques, and resources employed are ...</b>				
...clearly articulated with specific and significant details and compelling examples provided.	...identified with some details and adequate supporting examples.	...explained but may lack details or clarity.	...not clearly explained. Few or no details are provided.	...not provided or completely unclear
<b>Question 21. Outcomes: Evaluation and Qualitative and/or 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. <b>Program grants must explain how that specific program's impact will be evaluated and offer a timeline for the work that is well reasoned and achievable.</b>	Some data provides evidence that the organization/program is making (or is poised to make) meaningful impact. Evaluation of programs is evident.	Quantitative and/or qualitative 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/program is making a measurable impact. Little or no commitment to evaluation.	No indication of impact or processes of evaluation.

## YVCF Community Grant Cycle - 2025 Scoring Rubric

Score: 9-10 (Excellent)	Score 7-8 (Above Average)	Score 5-6 (Average)	Score 3-4 (Below Average)	Score 0-2 (Unsatisfactory)
<b>Question 22. 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.
<p>*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></p>				
<b>OPERATING GRANTS:</b>				
<b>Questions 23-26. Organizational Budget &amp; Financials: 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.
<b>PROGRAM GRANTS:</b>				
<b>Questions 23-26. Programmatic Budget: The budget specific to the program is ...</b>				
...clear, detailed, and compelling in its potential to achieve program goals. Applicant considered other funding sources and provided evidence for how expected revenues should be achievable. Demonstrates plans to make funding for long-term or pilot programs 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.