Guidelines for Scoring Grant Applications

Portland United Against Hate Special Appropriations

Minimum Requirements:

Each grant application is screened for minimum requirements prior to submission to the Grant Review Committee for scoring. Proposals which fulfill the following minimum requirements will be moved forward to Grant Review Committee and considered for funding:

1. Timely submission of grant application, *no late entries will be reviewed.*
2. Completed grant application, *sections left blank without explanation or incomplete sections or information will disqualify application.*
3. Contact information for lead staff person will be up-to-date and complete.
4. Project Budget will be complete. *Missing or incomplete budget will disqualify application.*
5. Application is filled out accurately. *Providing falsified information will automatically disqualify application.*

Please note that the final grant decisions will be made based on the following criteria:

- The overall score of the grant proposal based on the guideline detailed in this document.
- The overall evaluation of grant proposals to ensure representation of many marginalized communities, as identified by the City's Equity Plan.

Scoring Criteria and Levels:

Proposals will be ranked per the quality of the application as a whole, and how well the specified criteria are addressed. The committee will score from 0-10 for each criterion:

[10 Excellent] [7-9 Good] [4-6 Fair] [1-3 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]

1. Narrative, Purpose, Need and Who Benefits (10pts max possible)

Excellent: Project is thoroughly described leaving no doubt as to intention of project. Narrative indicates a well-planned project with purpose, a well-defined need and description of who benefits and how it meets city equity goals.

Good: Similar to above but lacking detail about the project description, purpose and/or justification. Has description of who benefits and how it meets city equity goals.

Fair: Project intent is stated, but narrative description is limited, leaving questions regarding certain aspects of the project.

Poor: Project intent is vague and poorly planned. Needs are not well-defined. Planning and preparing for this work appears to have been an afterthought.

Unacceptable: Project intent is not stated. Narrative does not have specific focus. Serious doubt as to whether applicant could successfully implement the project.

2. Scope of Work, Data and Measures (10pts max possible)

Excellent: Thorough description of scope of work and implementation. Includes a detailed plan of work and timeframe indicating approximately when each activity will be carried out and when work will be completed. Shows thorough understanding of how and what data should be collected to measure outputs and outcomes.

Good: Similar to above but may lack timeframe, tasks that need to be completed, or other minor information. Understands how and what data should be collected but less detail on measuring outputs and outcomes.

Fair: Includes a project implementation description but lacks many details. Project implementation plan or timeframe is vague. Doesn't understand measuring outputs and outcomes. Capacity to do this work is weak.

Poor: Project will probably get done but planning appears to be lacking. Information is missing or shows significant lack of understanding of data, measuring outputs or outcomes.

Unacceptable: Project implementation plan is unrealistic or nonexistent. Doubtful that project will be completed.

3. Partnerships and Collaboration (10pts max possible)

Excellent: Demonstrates a desire to, previous work on or thorough understanding of creating partnerships and why collaboration through the coalition is important. Partners are identified, commitment to work with broader coalition (and other grantees) is evident.

Good: Similar to above, but may not have existing partnerships, but instead, a willingness to create those, understands why collaboration through the coalition is important. Committed to work with broader coalition (and other grantees).

Fair: Understands partnerships and collaborations but shows no details in why they are important. Unsure of commitment to work with broader coalition (and other grantees).

Poor: Collaboration feels like an afterthought. No intentionality in building partnerships.

Unacceptable: Does not want to collaborate or partner with other organizations, not committed to work with coalition.

4. Leveraging of dollars and sustainability of efforts beyond this funding (10pts max possible)

Excellent: Demonstrates a strong capacity to leverage City dollars with current efforts of organization or other funding streams. Shows commitment to sustaining efforts beyond one year, and demonstrates how the efforts will be sustained.

Good: Similar to above, but may not provide as much detail.

Fair: Understands the need to sustain efforts, but doesn't show enough detail that efforts will be sustained. Leveraging of dollars is minimal.

Poor: It is very unlikely efforts can be sustained past one year. No intentionality in how work will continue.

Unacceptable: Shows no effort to sustain work past one year. No leverage at all.

5. Budget (10pts max possible)

Excellent: Project budget leaves no doubt that the associated costs are adequate and realistic. Budget is completed and descriptions are provided and relevant.

Good: Similar to above but less detail.

Fair: Some questions regarding the use of budget funds though still a good project.

Poor: Vague detail as to the use of budget funds.

Unacceptable: Lack of justification for utilization of funds, organization doesn't seem capable of managing money appropriately.

Important Dates/Timeline

Portland City Council, Special Appropriations $350,000 for Portland United Against Hate (PUAH)

July 25th, 6-7:30pm	Information Session
August 15, 5pm	Applications due
September 29, 5pm	Notice of Awards
October 15th, 5pm	1st Quarter Progress Report due (Jul 1st – Sep 30th, 2017)
January 15th, 5pm	2nd Quarter Progress Report due (Oct 1st – Dec 31st, 2017)
April 15th, 5pm	3rd Quarter Progress Report due (Jan 1st – Mar 31st, 2018)
July 15th, 5pm	4th Quarter Progress Report due (Apr 1st – Jun 30th, 2018)
July 31st, 5pm	Final Report due
Aug or Sep 2018 TBD	Presentation to City Council

office of
neighborhood
involvement