



### LGBTQ+ Fund Grant Rubric

The rubric will be used by the grant review committee members to evaluate each Letter of Intent (LOI) and Full Grant Application. The integrity of the rubric’s rating system will be maintained and paired with qualitative text area response questions asking reviewers for comments, applicant questions, or concerns. Applicants are encouraged to draft their responses to the grant questions to meet the criteria of the rubric.

#### Letter of Intent (LOI) Rubric

	Question	Weak (1-2)	Average (3)	Strong (4-5)
1	<b>Organization Description:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe what their organization does?	Unclear description. Does not articulate the need they’re trying to meet. Does not offer specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities.	Described what the organization does and described the need. Describes activities but is missing some specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities.	Very clear description of what they do, and need description is compelling with data. Offers specific details on the who, what, when, where and how of their activities.
2	<b>Funding Alignment:</b> Does the applicant’s work align with the mission, vision and values of the Ark River LGBTQ+ Fund?	Not defined or unclear if their work aligns with the fund. Does not state specific connection to the work or description lacks understanding of the mission, vision and values.	Articulates a connection to the fund, but description lacks specific details on how their work aligns with the mission, vision and values. Expresses a basic understanding of the fund's vision, mission and values.	Offers clearly defined connection to the mission, vision and values of the fund. Expresses a good understanding of the fund's mission, vision and values.
3	<b>DEI:</b> Did the applicant demonstrate its commitment to DEI?	Not defined or unclear description of organizations commitment to DEI. Statement is not clearly aligned with the values of the fund, or offers vague examples of how their commitment is carried into actions.	Articulates a description of commitment to DEI that is aligned to the fund’s values. Offers some examples of their commitment are carried into actions.	Offers a strong description of their commitment that is clearly aligned to the fund's values. Shares multiple, specific examples of how their commitment is carried into actions.
4	<b>Impact:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe the impact they are anticipating having?	Not defined or unclear what their impact will be in 2024. Does not identify a change in attitude, knowledge, behavior, or other measurable impact.	Articulates a defined change in attitude, knowledge, behavior or other measurable impact, but the description lacks not specific, measurable, and/or time-bound qualifiers.	Offers clearly defined changes in attitude, knowledge, behavior or other measurable impact. Description includes specific, measurable, time-bound changes that will take place due to their programs.

5	<b>Service to LGBTQ+ Community:</b> Is the applicant attempting to serve the LGBTQ+ community in specific and meaningful ways?	Applicant's description is unclear or does not describe specific ways they are trying to be inclusive to the LGBTQ+ community. Applicant's description includes unhelpful terminology or demonstrates a lack of understanding of the needs and intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community.	Applicant describes how they are attempting to serve the LGBTQ+ community but lacks specific details. Applicant indicates a basic understanding of the needs and intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community.	Has a clear description of specific ways they are working to serve the LGBTQ+ community and demonstrates a good understanding of the needs and intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community.
6	<b>Project:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe their project?	Unclear description. Does not articulate the need they're trying to meet. Does not offer specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities. Does not articulate a clear impact.	Described the needs and the impact of the project but approach is missing some specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities.	Very clear description of their intended impact, need description is compelling with data and . Offers specific details on the who, what, when, where and how of their activities.

Evaluator Recommendation:

Question	Options
Do you recommend this applicant move forward in the grant review process?	Yes/No

## Full Grant Application Rubric

	Question	Weak (1-2)	Average (3)	Strong (4-5)
1	<b>Organization Description:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe what their organization does?	Unclear description. Does not articulate the need they're trying to meet. Does not offer specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities.	Described what the organization does and described the need. Describes activities but is missing some specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities.	Very clear description of what they do, and need description is compelling with data. Offers specific details on the who, what, when, where and how of their activities.
2	<b>Service to LGBTQ+ Community:</b> Is the applicant attempting to serve the LGBTQ+ community in specific and meaningful ways?	Applicant's description is unclear or does not describe specific ways they are trying to be inclusive to the LGBTQ+ community. Applicant's description includes unhelpful terminology or demonstrates a lack of understanding of the needs and intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community.	Applicant describes how they are attempting to serve the LGBTQ+ community but lacks specific details. Applicant indicates a basic understanding of the needs and intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community.	Has a clear description of specific ways they are working to serve the LGBTQ+ community and demonstrates a good understanding of the needs and intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community.
3	<b>Project:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe their project?	Unclear description. Does not articulate the need they're trying to meet. Does not offer specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities. Does not articulate a clear impact.	Described the needs and the impact of the project but approach is missing some specifics on who, what, when, where and how of their activities.	Very clear description of their intended impact, need description is compelling with data and . Offers specific details on the who, what, when, where and how of their activities.
4	<b>Impact:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe the impact they are anticipating having?	Not defined or unclear what their impact will be in 2024. Does not identify a change in attitude, knowledge, behavior, or other measurable impact.	Articulates a defined change in attitude, knowledge, behavior or other measurable impact, but the description lacks not specific, measurable, and/or time-bound qualifiers.	Offers clearly defined changes in attitude, knowledge, behavior or other measurable impact. Description includes specific, measurable, time-bound changes that will take place due to their programs.



5	<b>Impact Determination:</b> Did the applicant clearly describe how they determine the impact of their project?	Unclear description of evaluation approach, data from the previous year and their goals for the coming year.	Describes an evaluation approach, offers some data from previous year and goals for coming year but approach may not measure all of their described impact.	Has a clearly described evaluation approach that measures all of their described impact. Shares data that demonstrates clear past impact and has clearly defined goals for the future.
6	<b>Community Benefit:</b> Did the applicant clearly define how the local LGBTQ+ community will benefit from their project?	Benefit to the LGBTQ+ community is not defined or compelling. Assumptions made in the project do not reflect a good understanding of sound approaches to meet the needs of the LGBTQ+ population.	Describes a clear benefit to the local LGBTQ+ community. Assumptions made in the project reflect a basic understanding of sound approaches to meet the needs of the LGBTQ+ population.	Benefit to the local LGBTQ+ community is clearly defined and compelling. Assumptions made in the project reflect a good understanding of sound approaches to meet the needs of the LGBTQ+ population.
7	<b>Partnerships:</b> Did the applicant clearly define their partnerships and collaborations?	No existing collaborations mentioned, cannot articulate how their services complement or differentiate from other services, no partners defined for the project.	Offers 1-2 collaborations. Offers clear explanation of how services compliment or differentiate from other services. Partners from respected entities with a successful track record of working in the LGBTQ+ space are identified for the project.	Describes strong collaborations with respected entities. Offers specific data on how their services compliment and differentiate from other services. Describes meaningful partnerships for the project with respected entities with a successful track record of working in the LGBTQ+ space.
8	<b>Capacity:</b> Does the applicant have the capacity to implement the project?	Identifies challenges that are unlikely to be overcome within the applicant's abilities, has blind spots for potential major challenges, is not able to articulate resources that will help overcome the challenges.	Identifies challenges that will be difficult but doable to overcome, has a basic understanding of potential challenges and has identified at least one resource to help overcome the obstacles.	Applicant has a good understanding of the challenges to implement the project, has identified multiple resources to overcome the obstacles, and has the capacity to deliver on the project goals.
9	<b>Financials:</b> Do the financials demonstrate adequate resources and capacity to carry out the described activities?	Financials suggest lack of sufficient resources and capacity to carry out the described activities.	Financials suggest adequate resources and capacity to carry out the described activities.	Financials suggest the organization is in a strong position to be able to carry out the described activities.



Evaluator Questions:

Question	Options	Comments
<b>Impact:</b> Does the organization describe clear potential to contribute measurable benefits to the local LGBTQ+ community?	Yes/No/Unsure	Please describe why or why not.
<b>Viability:</b> Are the activities described by the applicant financially and operationally sustainable? Will the organization achieve the impact described without facing major obstacles?	Yes/No/Unsure	Please describe why or why not.
<b>Opportunity:</b> Is there sufficient demand/opportunity for what’s being offered by the organization? Will the applicant meet a specific and important need in the local LGBTQ+ community?	Yes/No/Unsure	Please describe why or why not.

Evaluator Recommendation:

Question	Options
Do you recommend this applicant move forward in the grant review process?	Yes/No

