

YVCF Community Grant Cycle - 2026 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.
<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.
*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>FINANCE Rubric</b>				
<b>SCORE: 5 (Excellent)</b>	<b>SCORE: 4 (Above Average)</b>	<b>SCORE: 3 (Average)</b>	<b>SCORE: 2 (Below Average)</b>	<b>SCORE: 1 (Unsatisfactory)</b>
<b>Questions 23-26. Organizational Budget &amp; Financials</b>				
<b>Fiscal Solvency</b>				
Organization is clearly fiscally solvent. Cash reserves and/or liquid assets are appropriate relative to the operating (and program) budget. No material concerns about ability to meet obligations.	Generally solvent with minor concerns. Reserves or cash flow are adequate but may be tight or uneven at times.	Solvency is present but fragile. Limited reserves, reliance on timing of revenues, or short-term cash flow risk is evident.	Significant concerns about solvency. Minimal reserves, recurring deficits, or unresolved cash flow issues.	Organization or program is not fiscally solvent or financial viability is unclear or unsupported.
*Best practice recommends 3-9 months cash-on-hand, but we understand there may be reasons an organization has less, or more, than that amount. If your cash-on-hand is significantly higher or lower, please explain why in your application.				
<b>Financial Transparency</b>				
Financial statements are clear, concise, internally consistent, and easy to interpret. Revenue, expenses, and assumptions are well explained and appropriate to the request.	Statements are mostly clear and complete, with minor gaps or areas requiring interpretation. Overall financial picture is understandable.	Statements are provided but lack clarity, detail, or consistency. Some assumptions or line items are unclear.	Statements are confusing, incomplete, or difficult to interpret. Key information is missing or unclear.	Financial statements are missing, inaccurate, or insufficient to assess financial health.
<b>Financial Stability</b>				
Demonstrates strong financial stability through diversified funding sources, appropriate expenses, and a clear ability to sustain operations over time.	Financial stability is evident, though funding sources may be somewhat concentrated or sustainability plans modest.	Some indicators of stability, but reliance on limited funding sources or uncertain sustainability raises concern.	Financial stability is weak. Heavy reliance on one or two funding sources, unclear sustainability, or structural imbalance.	No evidence of financial stability or sustainability.
<b>PROGRAM GRANTS ONLY</b>				
<b>Questions 23b-23d. Program Financial Sustainability (referring to program budget).</b>				
Demonstrates strong budget with diversified funding sources, appropriate expenses, and a clear ability to sustain the program over time.	Budget demonstrates sustainability of program, though funding sources may be somewhat concentrated or future plans limited.	Some indicators of program stability, but reliance on limited funding sources or uncertain expenses raises concern.	Heavy reliance on one or two funding sources for the program, unclear costs, or structural imbalance.	No evidence of financial stability or sustainability.