

Focus Grant Evaluation Scoring Rubric

	5 (EXCELLENT)	3 (AVERAGE)	1 (POOR)
Need	Program clearly aligns with grant guidelines. Proposal makes a very clear and compelling case about why the program is necessary, who will benefit, and how it will expand opportunity for Delawareans to thrive. Current local data is provided supporting program need.	Program is loosely aligned with grant guidelines. Vague description and limited supporting data of local community need and who will benefit.	Program does not align with grant guidelines. Doesn't provide description of or data related to local community need.
Program Design	The program design is clearly and thoughtfully described and addresses the identified need, barriers faced by the community, and how the program will increase opportunities to thrive. The population to be served is specific and fully described. The program design is evidenced-based, best practice, or innovative. A clear and reasonable program budget is included.	Some elements of the program design are not clear. Proposal has a vague description of program details and of the population to be served. There is limited understanding of the need and barriers faced by the community, and how the program will increase opportunities to thrive. Program budget could be more cost-effective.	The program design is confusing and poorly described. The population served is omitted or not related to the need. The program appears to be outside the organization's scope of work. The program design does not mention needs or barriers faced by the community. Budget figures are incomplete and/or unreasonable.
Measuring Impact	Impact is focused, realistic, and measurable. Proposal demonstrates strong case for how the program will benefit the community. Outcomes are well-articulated and specific plans for measuring the outcomes and outputs are well thought-out, practical and provide meaningful data.	Impact lacks clarity or is somewhat unreasonable given the scope of the program. Proposal lacks sufficient information about how the program will benefit the community. Outcomes are vaguely defined, and specific plans to track outcomes and outputs are insufficient. The specific activities and timing are vague.	Proposal lacks any description or evidence of how the program will benefit the community. Program does not have clearly stated goals or outcomes, and lacks specific activities or clear methods of measurement to track success.
Organizational Capacity/Financial Health	Applicant makes compelling case for DCF funds, combined with other funds of which all/some are confirmed. Organizational financial health and long-term sustainability are strong. The organization has required capacity to complete the program and demonstrates a track record of success.	Application presents weak information on organizational financial health and long-term sustainability. Applicant presented a weak argument or insufficient details related to need for DCF funding. Scale of program would require funding beyond the DCF, but no other funding sources are identified.	Application lacks information on overall financial health and long-term sustainability of organization. There are concerns about organizational capacity or its ability to successfully complete the program.