



## Grant Application Scoring Rubric



Category	Meets expectations <i>(10-6 points)</i>	Does not meet expectations <i>(0-5 points)</i>
<b>Programmatic Review</b>		
<b>Executive Summary of the Project</b> (10 points)	The applicant <b>includes and describes</b> the project’s mission and vision, the target population the project will serve, the expected benefits to the community, the need for the project in the community with proposed evidence-based methods, interventions, and strategies that are realistic, attainable, effective, and outcome-oriented.	The applicant is unclear or <b>does not include or describe</b> the project’s mission and vision, the target population the project will serve, the expected benefits to the community, the need for the project in the community with proposed evidence-based methods, interventions, and strategies that are realistic, attainable, effective, and outcome-oriented.
<b>Community Need for the Project &amp; Strategic Plan Alignment</b> (10 points)	The applicant <b>identifies and defines a specific need(s)</b> for the project within the identified community and effectively describes the alignment of that need to the Desert Healthcare District and Foundation 2021-2026 Strategic Plan goals and strategies by using one of more of the following: data, case studies, interviews, focus group results, media coverage, etc.	The applicant <b>does not sufficiently identify or describe a need</b> for the project and/or its alignment to one of the Desert Healthcare District and Foundation 2021-2026 Strategic Plan goals and strategies by using one or more of the following: data, case studies, interviews, focus group results, media coverage, etc.
<b>Project Goals, Performance Measures, and Evaluation</b> (10 points)	The applicant has provided SMART goals with an evaluation plan that is comprehensively developed. The <b>SMART</b> goals are <b>specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bound</b> , and the evaluation plan will accurately measure the project’s effectiveness and impact. Within each goal, the applicant identifies a related performance measure as outlined in the Desert Healthcare District and Foundation 2021-2026 Strategic Plan.	The applicant has provided very limited goals and evaluation plans. The goals <b>are not specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, time-bound goals</b> and will not measure the project’s effectiveness or impact. Applicant did not identify related performance measures as outlined in the Desert Healthcare District and Foundation 2021-2026 Strategic Plan.

<p><b>Project Evaluation Plan</b> (10 points)</p>	<p>The applicant <b>provides a detailed plan of action for evaluation</b> that includes both qualitative and/or quantitative assessment(s). The plan includes well-defined data reporting mechanisms and/or a clear and transparent narrative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation measures and methods are clear; the applicant defines how they envision success.</li> <li>• Evaluation is in alignment with the SMART goals of the project.</li> <li>• Evaluation is in alignment with identified performance measure(s).</li> <li>• An explanation is provided on how the data collected from the project will be utilized for future programming, partnerships, and/or funding.</li> </ul>	<p>The applicant <b>does not provide, or vaguely describes, a plan of action</b> with limited qualitative and/or quantitative assessment(s). The plan includes poorly defined data reporting mechanisms and/or a narrative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation measures and methods are not clear; the applicant vaguely defines how they envision success.</li> <li>• Evaluation is not in alignment with the SMART goals of the project.</li> <li>• Evaluation is not in alignment with identified performance measure(s).</li> <li>• An explanation is not provided on how the data collected from the project will be utilized.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Applicant Capacity and Infrastructure to Execute Proposal</b> (10 points)</p>	<p>The applicant <b>includes examples that demonstrate</b> that the human resource allocation to this project is appropriate (internal staff expertise, use of external consultants, advisory committee, etc.). The <b>applicant demonstrates</b> reliability for this kind of work (strength, a history or track record of achievements, related mission, and letters of support)</p>	<p>The applicant <b>does not include examples that demonstrate</b> the human resource allocation to this project is appropriate (internal staff expertise, use of external consultants, advisory committee, etc.). The <b>applicant is limited in its ability to demonstrate</b> reliability for this kind of work (strength, a history or track record of achievements, related mission, and letters of support)</p>
<p><b>Organization Sustainability</b> (10 Points)</p>	<p>The applicant <b>demonstrates</b> that it has a current Strategic Plan. The applicant demonstrates strong Board engagement, governance, and fundraising support.</p>	<p>The applicant <b>does not sufficiently demonstrate</b> that it has a current Strategic Plan. The proposed program is not identified in the current Strategic Plan and the applicant organization has limited Board engagement, governance, and fundraising support.</p>

<p><b>Budget</b> (10 points)</p>	<p>The budget is <b>specific</b> and <b>reasonable</b>, and all items <b>align</b> with the described project. The proposed budget is accurate, cost-effective, and linked to activities and outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no unexplained amounts.</li> <li>• The overall significance of the project, including the relationship between benefits and/or participants to the programmatic costs are reasonable.</li> <li>• All line items are identified clearly in the budget narrative.</li> <li>• The budget shows committed, in-kind, or other funds that have been identified, secured, and in place to support the project.</li> </ul>	<p>The budget is <b>not specific</b> and/or <b>reasonable</b>, and the items are <b>poorly aligned</b> with the described project. The budget is included in the application but seems incomplete or not reflective of actual costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are unexplained amounts.</li> <li>• The overall significance of the project, including the relationship between benefits and/or participants to the programmatic costs are not reasonable.</li> <li>• Line items are not clearly defined in the budget narrative.</li> <li>• The budget does not show committed, in-kind, or other funds that have been identified, secured, and in place to support the project.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key Partners / Collaboration</b> (10 points)</p>	<p>The proposal <b>demonstrates a collaborative process</b> that includes multiple community partners involved in planning and implementation, with contributions from collaborators articulated in detail via letters of support and/or memorandums of understanding.</p>	<p>The proposal <b>does not demonstrate a collaborative process</b> and it does not involve multiple community partners in planning and implementation. Potential for collaboration exists but is not articulated.</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Review</b></p>		
<p><b>Fiduciary Compliance</b> (10 Points)</p>	<p><b>The applicant demonstrates</b> a financial history that shows a continuous cycle of fiduciary responsibility of the Board through unmodified audited financial statements produced in a timely fashion, positive cash flow at the end of each fiscal year, asset ratio meets required debt load, and the Board reviews financial statements regularly.</p>	<p><b>The applicant does not demonstrate</b> a financial history that shows a continuous cycle of fiduciary responsibility of the Board through audited financial statements. Positive cash flow at the end of each fiscal year is not consistent. and the Board does not review financials regularly.</p>

<b>Financial Stability</b> (10 Points)	Funding sources for operations and programs are from multiple sources and <b>are driven by a strategic plan</b> for stability for both short- and long-term growth. Fund development and/or business plan is in place to identify future sources of funding. The requested grant amount is <b>reasonable</b> in comparison to the overall organizational budget.	Source of funds for operations and programs are from limited sources and <b>are not driven by a strategic plan</b> . There is <b>no plan</b> for stability in place currently, including a fund development plan and/or business plan. The requested grant amount is <b>unreasonable</b> in comparison to the overall organizational operating budget.
---	--	--

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 100

**Recommendation:**

- Fully Fund
- Partially Fund – Possible restrictions/conditions
- No Funding