Community Impact Grant –Rural Micro-Grant Scoring Rubric and Award Selection Process

Applicant Organization: _____

Reviewer: _____

Date: _____

Purpose

Collaboratory staff will review eligible applications and select the grant recipient(s) for the community impact micro rural grant program.

Staff will use this scoring rubric to evaluate the information applicants are asked to provide in the grant application. Each scored category corresponds directly to an application question.

Final selections will be based on application scores, reviewer comments, and staff discussion of the seven scored categories in this rubric. Reviewer comments and discussion should be based only on the information requested in the application and the criteria identified in this rubric.

Review Process Overview

Step 1: Reviewer Scoring

Each eligible application will be reviewed by multiple Collaboratory staff members using the same scoring rubric. Applications will be assigned to reviewers using a consistent review-assignment process designed to support balanced and impartial evaluation.

Reviewers should score applications based on the information provided in the application. Reviewers should not award points based on assumptions or information that is not supported by the application.

Step 2: Reviewer Discussion

Reviewers will discuss:

- Indicator(s) Alignment
- Project Description, Goals, and Activities
- Measurable Outcomes

- Root Causes and System-Level Change Strategy
- Community Engagement
- Sustainability and Resource Leverage
- Collaboration and Partnerships

Step 3: Final Award

Collaboratory staff will select the grant recipient(s) based on the application scores, reviewer comments, and discussion of the seven scored categories in this rubric.

Scoring Rubric

Total Possible Score: 100 Points

---

1. Coalition Indicator Alignment

30 Points

Evaluation Question:
How clearly does the proposed project align with and seek to influence the selected indicator(s)?

Priority indicators: See Indicator Appendix

Review considerations:

- Clear connection between the proposed project and the selected indicator(s)
- Clear explanation of how the project will influence the selected indicator(s)
- Relevant data demonstrating the need for the proposed work

Score	Description

23-30	The applicant clearly identifies the selected indicator(s), clearly explains how the project will influence the indicator(s), and provides relevant data demonstrating need.
16-22	The applicant addresses the selected indicator(s), how the project will influence it, and the need for the work with supporting data, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
8-15	The applicant addresses some of the required elements, but the connection to the selected indicator(s), explanation of influence, or data demonstrating need is limited or unclear.
0–7	The applicant provides limited or unclear information about the selected indicator(s), how the project will influence it, or the data demonstrating need.

Score: ____ /30

---

2. Project Description, Goals, and Activities

10 Points

Evaluation Question:
How clearly does the applicant describe the proposed project, its goals, and the activities that will be implemented?

Review considerations:

- Clarity of the proposed project description
- Clearly stated project goals
- Clearly described project activities

Score	Description
9-10	The applicant provides a clear and well-developed description of the proposed project, its goals, and the activities that will be implemented.
6-8	The applicant describes the proposed project, its goals, and activities, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
3-5	The applicant provides a general project description, but the project, goals, or activities are limited or unclear.
0–2	The applicant provides limited or unclear information about the proposed project, its goals, or activities.

Score: ____ /10

---

3. Measurable Outcomes

15 Points

Evaluation Question:
How clearly does the applicant identify measurable outcomes that will result from the project, including short-term outcomes and anticipated system-level outcomes?

Review considerations:

- Whether measurable outcomes are clearly identified
- Whether short-term outcomes are included
- Whether anticipated system-level outcomes are included

Score	Description
13-15	The applicant clearly identifies measurable outcomes, including short-term outcomes and anticipated system-level outcomes.
9-12	The applicant identifies measurable outcomes, including short-term and anticipated system-level outcomes, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
5-8	The applicant identifies some outcomes, but they are difficult to measure or information about short-term or anticipated system-level outcomes is limited or unclear.
0-4	The applicant provides limited or unclear measurable outcomes or does not clearly address short-term and anticipated system-level outcomes.

Score: ____ /15

---

4. Root Causes and System-Level Change Strategy

10 Points

Evaluation Question:
To what extent does the applicant identify the underlying conditions, barriers, policies, practices, or systems contributing to the issue and explain how the project will influence or change those conditions?

Review considerations:

- Identification of the underlying conditions, barriers, policies, practices, or systems contributing to the issue
- Explanation of how the project will influence or change those identified conditions, barriers, policies, practices, or systems
- Clarity of the relationship between the identified issue and the proposed system-level change

Score	Description
9-10	The applicant clearly identifies the underlying conditions, barriers, policies, practices, or systems contributing to the issue and clearly explains how the project will influence or change those conditions.
6-8	The applicant identifies the underlying conditions, barriers, policies, practices, or systems and explains how the project will influence or change them, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
3-5	The applicant identifies some underlying conditions, barriers, policies, practices, or systems, but the explanation of how the project will influence or change them is limited or unclear.
0-2	The applicant provides limited or unclear information about the underlying conditions contributing to the issue or how the project will influence or change them.

Score: ____ /10

---

5. Community Engagement

10 Points

Evaluation Question:
To what extent does the applicant explain how community members, particularly those most affected by the issue, informed the development of the project and how they will continue to participate in implementation and evaluation?

Review considerations:

- How community members informed project development
- How community members will continue to participate in implementation
- How community members will continue to participate in evaluation

Score	Description
9–10	The applicant clearly explains how community members informed project development and provides clear information about their continued participation in implementation and evaluation.
6–8	The applicant addresses community involvement in project development and continued participation, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
3–5	The applicant describes some community involvement, but information about participation in development, implementation, or evaluation is limited or unclear.
0–2	The applicant provides minimal or no information about community involvement in project development, implementation, or evaluation.

Score: ____ /10

---

6. Sustainability and Resource Leverage

15 Points

Evaluation Question:
How clearly does the applicant explain how the project's impact will continue beyond the funding period and how the project will leverage resources to support the work?

Review considerations:

- Explanation of how the project's impact will continue beyond the one-year funding period
- Identification of partnerships, funding sources, policies, practices, or structures that will help sustain the work
- Explanation of how the project will leverage additional funding, partnerships, volunteer support, or other community resources

Score	Description
13–15	The applicant clearly explains how the project's impact will continue beyond the one-year funding period, identifies the partnerships, funding sources, policies, practices, or structures that will help sustain the work, and explains how additional resources will be leveraged.
9–12	The applicant addresses sustainability and resource leverage, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
5–8	The applicant provides some information about sustainability or resource leverage, but one or more required elements are limited or unclear.
0–4	The applicant provides limited or unclear information about how the project's impact will continue beyond the grant period or how resources will be leveraged.

Score: ____ /15

---

7. Collaboration and Partnerships

10 Points

Evaluation Question:
How clearly does the applicant describe the partnerships or cross-sector collaborations involved in the project and explain how those partnerships will contribute to achieving lasting community impact?

Review considerations:

- Identification of partnerships or cross-sector collaborations involved in the project
- Explanation of how those partnerships or collaborations contribute to achieving lasting community impact

Score	Description
9–10	The applicant clearly identifies the partnerships or cross-sector collaborations involved in the project and clearly explains how they will contribute to achieving lasting community impact.
6–8	The applicant identifies partnerships or collaborations and explains their contribution to lasting community impact, but one or more elements could be more clearly or fully developed.
3–5	The applicant identifies partnerships or collaborations, but their contribution to lasting community impact is limited or unclear.
0–2	The applicant provides little or no information about partnerships, collaborations, or their contribution to lasting community impact.

Score: ____ /10

Cross Coalition System-Level Indicator & Secondary Alignment

Reviewed as Part of Overall Strategic Alignment (No Additional Points)

This section does not add or subtract points from the application score.

Evaluation Question:

If the applicant identifies additional Collaboratory system-level indicators, how does the applicant describe the project's influence on those indicators?

Secondary Collaboratory System-Level Indicators:

- Prenatal Care 1st Trimester
- Uninsured Population Under Age 65
- Behavioral Health Workforce: Percentage of Community Need Met
- Kindergarten Readiness Rate
- High School Graduation Rate

- Skilled Workforce Rate
- Housing and Transportation Affordability
- Food Environment Score
- Percentage of Residents with Access to High-Speed Internet

Review Considerations:

- Whether the applicant identified additional indicators, if applicable
- How the applicant describes the project's influence on the identified additional indicator(s)

Reviewer Notes:

Secondary Indicator Alignment Identified:

☐ Yes
☐ No secondary indicators identified

Secondary Indicator(s):

Reviewer Score Summary

Category	Points Available	Score
Coalition Indicator Alignment	30	
Project Description, Goals, and Activities	10	
Measurable Outcomes	15	
Root Causes and System-Level Change Strategy	10	
Community Engagement	10	
Sustainability and Resource Leverage	15	
Collaboration and Partnerships	10	
Total Score	**100**	

Staff Deliberation and Award Recommendation:

Overall Reviewer Assessment

Proposal Strengths:

Questions or Concerns:

Reviewer Selection Considerations

In selecting the final award recipient, staff will consider only the seven scored categories in this rubric and the overall application score:

☐ Overall application score
☐ Coalition Indicator Alignment
☐ Project Description, Goals, and Activities
☐ Measurable Outcomes

☐ Root Causes and System-Level Change Strategy
☐ Community Engagement
☐ Sustainability and Resource Leverage
☐ Collaboration and Partnerships

Final Staff Recommendation

Applicant Recommended for Award:

Recommendations:

☐ Recommend for Award

☐ Recommend for Further Consideration

☐ Do Not Recommend for Award

Final Staff Rationale:

The final rationale should be based on the seven categories in this rubric.

If staff recommends an applicant other than the highest-scoring applicant, the rationale should explain the decision using only the seven scored categories.

Conflict of Interest Statement

Staff members must disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest related to an application. Staff members with a conflict must recuse themselves from reviewing, scoring, discussing, or making recommendations regarding that application.