Organizational Capacity (10 Points)					
Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
2-5	Describe how the Agency's Board of Directors functions as an active, community-representative body responsible for policy setting, fiscal guidance, and ongoing governance.	The Board of Directors is highly active, diverse, and representative of the community. The board provides clear leadership in policy setting, offers sound fiscal guidance, and demonstrates strong ongoing governance. Their role is well defined, and evidence of their involvement is provided.	The Board of Directors plays a moderate role in policy setting, fiscal guidance, and governance. The board's community representation is somewhat evident, but the description lacks depth or specific examples of their active involvement.	The Board of Directors is inactive or plays no meaningful role in policy setting, fiscal guidance, or governance. There is no representation of the community, and the board's involvement is either absent or not described.	
5-6	**Describe how the agency ensures financial stability and its ability to leverage grant dollars to deliver the program. Include details on contingencies such as cash reserves, diverse funding streams, and a fundraising plan**	The agency is highly financially stable, with diverse funding streams, significant cash reserves, and a well-defined fundraising plan. The agency has a clear ability to leverage grant dollars effectively and has strong contingencies in place to ensure program delivery under various circumstances.	The agency shows moderate financial stability, with some evidence of funding stream diversity and basic contingency planning. Cash reserves may be limited or unclear, and the fundraising plan lacks detail. The agency can leverage grant dollars, though improvements are needed.	The agency is financially unstable, with no diverse funding streams, cash reserves, or fundraising plan. There are no clear contingencies in place, and the agency shows no ability to leverage grant dollars to ensure program delivery.	

Program Information (25 Points)					
Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
8-11	How does the program align with the funding priority, and what evidence supports the need for the service? Provide detailed information on how the program meets the identified need.	The program is strongly aligned with the funding priority, with comprehensive research and data that clearly support the need for services. The program description is clear, detailed, and thoroughly explains how the program will address the identified need for services, leaving no ambiguity.	The program shows general alignment with the funding priority, with some research or data provided, though it may be limited or not fully convincing. The program description is adequate but lacks depth or detail in explaining how it will address the need for services.	The program is not aligned with the funding priority, with no research or data to support the need for services. The program description is unclear or incomplete, and it does not explain how the need for services will be addressed.	
14	Describe the research-based best practices that your program follows and provide data or evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of these strategies in achieving the desired outcomes.	The program clearly outlines research-based best practices and provides comprehensive, relevant data that strongly demonstrates the effectiveness of the strategies in achieving desired outcomes. Evidence is current, credible, and directly supports the proposed methods.	The program describes research-based practices and presents some data to show effectiveness, but the evidence is either limited in scope or not fully aligned with the strategies.	The program does not describe research-based practices or provide data to support the effectiveness of the strategies. No credible evidence is presented.	
15	Who is the target population and how are they	The target population is clearly defined with specific	The target population is identified, but with limited	The target population is not clearly identified, and	

	made aware of the program?	demographics, needs, and characteristics. The program uses comprehensive, multi-faceted outreach strategies (e.g., social media, community partnerships, direct engagement) that are well-suited to the target audience and have proven effective in reaching them.	specificity or clarity. The program utilizes basic or minimal outreach strategies, which may have some success but lack innovation or sufficient detail.	the outreach strategies are either missing or entirely ineffective for reaching the intended audience. No evidence of successful engagement.	
16-19	How does your program ensure accessibility for participants, including considerations for transportation, waitlists, fees, location, and hours of operation? (Separate these out)	The program comprehensively addresses all aspects of accessibility, including providing transportation options, minimizing or eliminating waitlists, offering affordable or sliding-scale fees, and ensuring that the location is convenient and hours are flexible to meet the needs of the target population. Solutions are well thought out, and there is clear evidence of their effectiveness in	The program addresses some accessibility factors but lacks full coverage of all key areas. For example, transportation or fee assistance might be addressed, but there are gaps in addressing waitlists, location, or hours.	The program does not address accessibility in a meaningful way. Transportation, fees, location, waitlists, or hours are not considered, resulting in significant barriers to access for the target population.	

Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
		ensuring broad access to the program.			
21	What strategies does the program use to build parent engagement, and how effective are these strategies in fostering participation?	The program has well-defined, comprehensive strategies for building parent engagement. The strategies are innovative, clearly explained, and have been proven to effectively foster strong and consistent parent participation.	The program provides some strategies for building parent engagement, but they are either vague or not fully developed. The effectiveness of the strategies is not well-demonstrated, and participation may be inconsistent.	The program does not have any clear strategies for building parent engagement. There is no plan or evidence of attempts to foster parent involvement, and participation is minimal or nonexistent	
Outcome 1 (20 Points)					
Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
24	Outcome Structure: The outcome statement outlines a clear change, identifies the focus area, defines the target population, and explains how the outcome will be achieved.	The outcome statement includes a change statement, focus area, target population, and how it will be achieved.	The outcome includes 3 of the four components	The outcome includes 2 or less	
25	Indicators and Tools	The indicator includes a clear, measurable sign that demonstrates the outcome is being met. The program also uses a valid,	The indicator includes a measurable sign, but it lacks full clarity or depth in showing the outcome is being met. A	The indicator does not include a measurable sign of progress toward the outcome, and/or no valid	

		research-based tool that is appropriate for the target population and effectively measures progress toward the outcome.	tool is used, but its validity or research basis is not fully demonstrated, or it may not fully align with the desired progress.	or research-based tool is used to demonstrate progress. There is no clear method to show that the outcome is being met.	
26	Alignment: Do the program's outcome connect to the specified funding priority and focus area, and how are the program's activities aligned to achieve the desired result?	The outcome is clearly and directly connected to the funding priority and focus area, with program activities fully aligned to achieve the desired result. The connection between the outcome, activities, and goals is	The outcome shows some alignment with the funding priority and focus area, but the connection between program activities and the desired result is not fully clear	The outcome is not aligned with the funding priority and focus area, and program activities do not support the desired result. There is no clear connection between the outcome, the activities, and the grant's goals.	
27-29	Data Collection: Change in grant who is responsible for collecting data. Where will they get the data from, How often will you measure progress?	The indicator clearly defines how the program will measure progress toward the outcome, with specific, measurable criteria.	The indicator provides a basic way to measure progress, but it lacks clarity, specificity, or measurable benchmarks. There is some alignment with the outcome, but the indicator may not provide an actionable or practical way to assess progress.	The indicator does not define how progress will be measured. There is no alignment with the outcome, and no measurable benchmarks or criteria are provided. The indicator is either missing or completely ineffective in guiding the assessment of progress.	
			Outcome 2 (20 Points)		

Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
24	Outcome Structure: The outcome statement outlines a clear change, identifies the focus area, defines the target population, and explains how the outcome will be achieved.	The outcome statement includes a change statement, focus area, target population, and how it will be achieved.	The outcome includes 3 of the four components	The outcome includes 2 or less	
25	Indicators and Tools	The indicator includes a clear, measurable sign that demonstrates the outcome is being met. The program also uses a valid, research-based tool that is appropriate for the target population and effectively measures progress toward the outcome.	The indicator includes a measurable sign, but it lacks full clarity or depth in showing the outcome is being met. A tool is used, but its validity or research basis is not fully demonstrated, or it may not fully align with the desired progress.	The indicator does not include a measurable sign of progress toward the outcome, and/or no valid or research-based tool is used to demonstrate progress. There is no clear method to show that the outcome is being met.	
26	Alignment: Do the program's outcome connect to the specified funding priority and focus area, and how are the program's activities aligned to	The outcome is clearly and directly connected to the funding priority and focus area, with program activities fully aligned to achieve the desired result. The connection	The outcome shows some alignment with the funding priority and focus area, but the connection between program activities and the desired	The outcome is not aligned with the funding priority and focus area, and program activities do not support the desired result. There is no clear connection	

	achieve the desired result?	between the outcome, activities, and goals is	result is not fully clear	between the outcome, the activities, and the grant's goals.	
27-29	Data Collection: Change in grant who is responsible for collecting data. Where will they get the data from, How often will you measure progress?	The indicator clearly defines how the program will measure progress toward the outcome, with specific, measurable criteria.	The indicator provides a basic way to measure progress, but it lacks clarity, specificity, or measurable benchmarks. There is some alignment with the outcome, but the indicator may not provide an actionable or practical way to assess progress.	The indicator does not define how progress will be measured. There is no alignment with the outcome, and no measurable benchmarks or criteria are provided. The indicator is either missing or completely ineffective in guiding the assessment of progress.	
Outcome 3 (20 Points)
Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
24	Outcome Structure: The outcome statement outlines a clear change, identifies the focus area, defines the target population, and explains how the outcome will be achieved.	The outcome statement includes a change statement, focus area, target population, and how it will be achieved.	The outcome includes 3 of the four components	The outcome includes 2 or less	
25	Indicators and Tools	The indicator includes a clear, measurable sign that	The indicator includes a measurable sign, but it lacks	The indicator does not include a measurable	

		demonstrates the outcome is being met. The program also uses a valid, research-based tool that is appropriate for the target population and effectively measures progress toward the outcome.	full clarity or depth in showing the outcome is being met. A tool is used, but its validity or research basis is not fully demonstrated, or it may not fully align with the desired progress.	sign of progress toward the outcome, and/or no valid or research-based tool is used to demonstrate progress. There is no clear method to show that the outcome is being met.
26	Alignment: Do the program's outcome connect to the specified funding priority and focus area, and how are the program's activities aligned to achieve the desired result?	The outcome is clearly and directly connected to the funding priority and focus area, with program activities fully aligned to achieve the desired result. The connection between the outcome, activities, and goals is	The outcome shows some alignment with the funding priority and focus area, but the connection between program activities and the desired result is not fully clear	The outcome is not aligned with the funding priority and focus area, and program activities do not support the desired result. There is no clear connection between the outcome, the activities, and the grant's goals.	
27-29	Data Collection: Change in grant who is responsible for collecting data. Where will they get the data from, How often will you measure progress?	The indicator clearly defines how the program will measure progress toward the outcome, with specific, measurable criteria.	The indicator provides a basic way to measure progress, but it lacks clarity, specificity, or measurable benchmarks. There is some alignment with the outcome, but the indicator may not provide an actionable or practical way to	The indicator does not define how progress will be measured. There is no alignment with the outcome, and no measurable benchmarks or criteria are provided. The indicator is either missing or completely	

			assess progress.	ineffective in guiding the assessment of progress.	
			Finance (15 Points)		
Grant Question(s)	What to look for	5	3	1	Missing
	<u>Appropriateness of Funding Request</u> Is the funding request appropriate for the proposed activities, and does it directly support the delivery of services	The funding request is fully appropriate for the proposed activities and clearly supports the delivery of direct services.	The funding request is somewhat appropriate, but there are gaps in how well it supports the proposed activities and direct services.	The funding request is inappropriate or excessive for the proposed activities, with little to no connection to direct service delivery.	
	<u>Justification, and Sustainability</u> Is the cost estimate realistic, justified, and sustainable beyond the grant period?	The cost estimate is highly realistic, fully justified, and includes a clear plan for sustainability beyond the grant period. The program shows strong evidence of its financial viability and long-term impact.	The cost estimate is somewhat realistic and justified, but lacks a clear plan for sustainability beyond the grant period. The long-term viability of the program is not fully convincing.	The cost estimate is unrealistic or unjustified, and there is no plan for sustainability beyond the grant period. The program lacks a clear financial strategy for long-term success.	
	<u>Other Funding Sources</u> Does the budget clearly explain and identify other sources of funding?	The budget clearly explains and identifies all other sources of funding. There is strong transparency regarding additional funding, and the explanation shows how these sources	The budget includes some information on other funding sources but lacks full clarity or detail. The explanation is somewhat vague, and it is unclear how these sources contribute to	The budget does not identify or explain other funding sources. There is no transparency regarding additional funding, leaving questions	

		contribute to the overall financial stability of the program.	the program's financial stability.	about the program's overall financial stability.	

Bonus Point Section: Addressing Identified Needs and Achieving Outcomes			
Grant Questions	Criteria	Description	Points
7	Preventative or Early Intervention Program	The program is preventative or provides early interventions that address root causes and reduce long-term issues	1-3
9-11, 33	Addresses Needs in Underserved Communities	The program addresses significant needs in underserved or marginalized communities, providing essential services (1-3 points based on level of impact).	1-3
9-11, 34	Addresses Needs in Geographical Areas with Limited Support	The program provides services to geographical areas where there is limited existing support or resources (1-3 points based on the scope and importance of service delivery).	1-3
9-11	New Program Created to Address a Unique, Unmet Need	The program is new and was developed to meet a unique, previously unmet need in the community (1-3 points based on innovation and impact).	1-3
23	(Previously Funded) Program Met All Outcomes in the Previous Year	If the program was funded in the previous year, it successfully met or exceeded all three identified outcomes (3 points)	3