

COMMUNITY GRANTS | PROPOSAL REVIEW GUIDELINES

Each category corresponds with a tab on CFNIL's grant application. Score each category 1-5 with 5 being the highest. The cumulative scores will inform the committee's discussion but will not be the only criteria used in the decision-making process for reviewing grants.

WEIGHTED SCORE RANGE: 7 - 35 POINTS

I. SUMMARY (NO SCORE)

II. MEASURING RESULTS (2 - 10 POINTS, WEIGHT 2)

- Are the intended results well-defined and desirable for participants and/or the community?
- Are the proposed indicators an accurate gauge of success?
- Are the proposed targets attainable and representative of improvement?
- Are the intended results measurable?
- Does the applicant have a plan for collecting data and measuring results?
- Do the benchmarks provide adequate context for the specified indicators and targets?
- If the proposal is for an existing program or reoccurring event, has the program or event had a measurably positive impact on the community?
- If the proposal is for a new charitable activity, is it sensible given the applicant's mission, long-term goals, and priorities?

III. COMMUNITY NEED (1-5 POINTS, WEIGHT 1)

- Does the proposal align with one of CFNIL's Focus Areas and funding priorities?
- Is the community need clearly defined?
- Is the target population well defined in terms of number of individuals served and the demographics of those individuals?
- Does the target population need these services?

IV. PROPOSAL PLAN (2-10 POINTS, WEIGHT 2)

- Does the proposal have a clear plan for how the applicant will execute the charitable activity?
- Does the project align with the organization's mission and current activities?
- Will funding this opportunity give the applicant an opportunity to leverage other funding or other resources (e.g., volunteer hours)?
- Does the proposal address root causes or propose systemic improvement?
- Will the proposal build the applicant's capacity to deliver more of their services?
- Is the proposal part of a collaboration*? If so:

- o Do all participants have a shared vision for change? A common understanding of the problem? A collaborative approach to solving it?
- Do the participants have a plan for collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants?
- Have the participants spelled out who will do what and how their work will be coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action?
- Have the participants agreed that one organization will serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and coordinate the participating organizations?
- Does the collaborative nature of the proposal maximize resources and enable the leveraging of assets?
- * Note: Reviewers should not deduct points from the Proposal Plan Tab if collaboration would not enhance the proposal. Questions about collaborations are based on FSG's Collective Impact model: http://www.fsg.org/approach-areas/collective-impact

V. PROPOSAL BUDGET (1-5 POINTS, WEIGHT 1)

- Has the organization used CFNIL's Budget Template?
- Is the budget clear and realistic?
- Is the requested amount appropriate for the proposed activities and desired results?
- If CFNIL is not the sole provider of funding, is the applicant likely to raise the balance of the funds needed to execute the proposal?
- Has the organization made a good faith effort to determine the most cost-effective options for their expenses?
- If the budget contains capital expenditures or depreciation, are the amounts appropriate to the scope and duration of the project, program, or event?
- If the budget contains indirect costs, are the indirect costs logical and appropriate for the project, program, or event?

VI. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY (1-5 POINTS, WEIGHT 1)

- Does the applicant have appropriate executive and staff leadership to execute the proposal?
- Is the organization, including its leadership, experienced in the type of work proposed?
- Is the organization financially sound?
- Is there any indication that financial troubles will interfere with the organization's ability to execute the proposal?

VII. GRANT AGREEMENT (NO SCORE)