2018 General Fund Application Evaluation Scoring Rubric

Categories/ Questions	1-Low	2	3-Medium	4	5-High
COMMUNITY NEED	Project is redundant of work already being done and/or no real need is demonstrated in the proposal		Proposal demonstrates a moderate need for the project. The organization can likely meet that need in a timely fashion.		Proposal demonstrates a significant and critical, localized and timely need for the project. The organization is in a key strategic position to make progress during the year of grant funding.
STRATEGY/ FEASABILITY	Proposal has ill-defined goals and/or does not include realistic or effective strategies to achieve intended goals. The goals don't relate that well to the need identified. Project is unlikely to succeed.		The proposal includes realistic goals relevant to the identified need, but the work proposed to achieve these goals is not very innovative.		Proposal has clear goals, and presents a solid innovative strategy for achieving anticipated goals. The proposal includes a well-thought-out timeline and evidence-based techniques. Necessary infrastructure/org capacity is in place to successfully complete the project.
IMPACT/ROI	Project is unlikely to have any significant impact. There would be no or very little return on investment.		The project would offer broad benefit to the community, but it's not evident overall impact will be that significant in terms of people affected or lasting change achieved.		The project will have very significant and far-reaching impact on enhancing the greater La Crosse area and its residents. It is evident ROI would be high if proposed outcomes were achieved within the proposed budget. Impact would extend beyond those directly served and would be long lasting.
PARTNERS/ COLLABORATION	The applicant did not consider other partners and/or isn't open to working with other organization/groups. This project would be a duplication of other already existing services.		Other partners were identified, but there could be more to be most effective. Some duplication of service may happen. No formal commitments from partners have been made yet. It doesn't appear much thought has been given to the division of labor and how that will be managed. *Or, no other partners are necessary for the project to be successful to avoid duplication.*		The organization has considered who else to involve in their proposed project to improve effectiveness and/or eliminate duplication of service. These partners were already contacted and committed to involvement if the project is funded. All partners know their roles.
ORG FIT	The request does not align with the applicant org's mission. The proposed work would be complete mission drift. There is no prior history of doing similar work and/or serving the project's target population.		The project/program doesn't seem like a complete 180 of the organization's mission and previous work, but there is little evidence to suggest this is something the org should be pursuing. If the org has no relevant history, then an active strategic plan exists to show why the org is pursuing this project now.		It is clear the project/program fits perfectly within the org's mission. The organization has previous experience doing similar work and/or working with the project/program's target population. There is no other org in town that could do it (or at least lead it) better.

Categories/ Questions	1-Low	2	3-Medium	4	5-High
EVALUATION	There is no plan or a very poor plan to evaluate the project. The applicant doesn't list appropriate outputs and/or outcomes to measure.		The proposal outlines some possible measures of gauging effectiveness at the project's completion. Evaluation strategies are based more on output data than measurable outcomes.		Clear measures to prove effectiveness (outcomes/results) are identified and plans on how data will be collected to track those results is clear and realistic.
BUDGET	The submitted budget is incomplete and/or unrealistic. Needed revenue seems too little or too large for proposed work and intended goals. Expenses are questionable.		A complete budget was submitted, and it seems realistic, but you're just not quite sure it is up to snuff. Few or no other funders are listed for needed project revenue.		The budget form was completed in its entirety. All project expenses and other revenue sources are included, and are realistic considering audience size and stated goals. Expenses noted are appropriate and comparable. LCF would not be the only funder.
SUSTAINABILITY	There is no plan for sustainability past LCF support, and the organization's ability to develop a sustainability plan that is attainable seems unlikely.		There is no or not a great plan for sustainability identified at this time, but the organization appears to have the capacity and intent to sustain the project/program past LCF support.		There is a plan for project/program sustainability post LCF support (that doesn't include continued LCF support). The plan is realistic and attainable. The organization's intent and capacity to sustain the program is very evident.
ORG HEALTH	There is little or no agency history to determine health. The organization's reputation is questionable or has been in the past. Leadership capacity and competence is lacking. Finances appear very volatile.		The organization has a good reputation for its work. Staff are competent. Board is engaged but could use more development. Finances are stable; general operating revenue comes from diverse sources.		Organization's caliber of services and leadership is high. The organization is financially secure. The board is actively engaged in organizational governance.
FUNDING OPINION	You do not support funding this project for any amount, regardless of proposal quality. You do not believe it should be high priority for the foundation (even if it is a well-planned project and/or the org has capacity to do it). You think there are too many other important things to fund.		You are ambivalent. You believe the proposal is well written, and you would feel fine if it got funded for any amount, however you're not sure it should be of highest priority.		Regardless of any of your other scores, you believe this project/program should be a priority for the foundation to fund. You strongly believe the organization has the ability to carry-out its proposed work, and that the community needs this now.