



## Community Care Fund Evaluation Guidelines & Criteria

### Purpose:

- To have a set of guidelines that ensures that all reviewers are evaluating based on the same criteria
- To have quantitative representation to help us narrow down organizations that are clear yeses and clear no's so that we can focus on the maybes
- To have a clear point of reference to show where reviewers' evaluations are similar and different
- To draw out from reviewer's key points for discussion/consideration and any important questions for decision-making.

### Process:

- The grant reviewers will individually evaluate each application
- The grants team then meets to review, discuss, and finalize funding recommendations
- The grants docket is sent to the CEO and Board (Executive Committee) for final approval
- Organizations are notified of their application status
  - Awarded organizations will receive follow-up steps

### Scoring Explanation:

The rubric follows a point system ranging from Unclear (0)- Strong (3) for four key areas: community care; social justice values; Black, Brown, Indigenous, and other Racialized Peoples (BBIRP) Community Participation; and Trans, Gender Queer, and Two Spirit Community Participation. The highest and lowest score each organization can achieve from the rubric alone is 12 and 0, respectively. The score from the rubric is then supplemented with an overall quantitative score ranging from 0-4 (Definitely not—Definitely yes). In total, the highest score an organization can reach is 16, and the lowest

is 0.

Organizations need to score at least 2 points in each of the key areas.

Participation means active engagement and leadership throughout all levels of the organization including board, staff, volunteers, and program participants.

While the grants team primarily utilizes quantitative representation to help with evaluation, qualitative and reflective questions and discussion are implemented to help provide a holistic and balanced review and highlight any biases that are contributing to our decision-making.

The grants team may reach out to some applicants if more information is required to help make a decision.

**Preliminary Questions:**

- 1) Does the organization meet the general criteria: Yes   No

If No, what criteria do they not meet:

- A. Organizational budget is over \$750,000 **and** has more than 5 FTE
- B. Organization is not focused on supporting LGBTQIA2S+ communities in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and/or Washington
- C. Organization does not have a 501(c)3 status or is not fiscally sponsored\*

a. \*Groups without a 501(c)3 or fiscal sponsorship are still encouraged to reach out to the grants team.

- 2) What is the primary activity and strategy of the proposed work? What is their approach to 'community care'?

- 3) Is the organization a current or past grantee?   Current      Past      N/a      New to Us

## Quantitative Rubric

CRITERION	STRONG (3)	PRACTICING (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	UNCLEAR (0)
<b>Community Care</b>	The organization clearly outlines their response to community needs.  The intended impacts of the response are also clearly specified and described.	The organization somewhat outlines their response to community needs.  Some details of the intended impacts of the response are described.	The organization does not clearly state their response to community needs.  The intended impacts of the response are not specified or described.	The organization does not provide enough information to assess the criteria area.
<b>Social Justice Values</b>	The organization demonstrates a strong commitment to intersectional praxis and social justice values.	The organization is committed to intersectional praxis and social justice values.	The organization is still developing an intersectional praxis and commitment to social justice values.	The organization does not provide enough information to assess the criteria area.  Or the organization does not practice social justice values.

<b>Black, Brown, Indigenous, and other Racialized Peoples (BBIRP) Community Participation</b>	The organization has Black, Brown, Indigenous, and other Racialized Peoples' leadership in every (~75% or more) aspect of the organization.	The organization has Black, Brown, Indigenous, and other Racialized Peoples' leadership in most (~61-75%) of organization.	The organization has Black, Brown, Indigenous, and other Racialized Peoples' leadership in ~60% or less of the organization.	The organization does not provide enough information to assess the criteria area.  Or the organization does not have Black, Brown, Indigenous, and other Racialized Peoples' leadership in most of the organization.
<b>Trans, Gender Queer, and Two Spirit Participation</b>	The organization has trans, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation in every (~75% or more) aspect of the organization.	The organization has trans, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation in most (~61-75%) of the organizations.	The organization has trans, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation in ~60% or less of the organization.	The organization does not provide enough information to assess the criteria area.  Or the organization does not have trans, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation in most of the organization.

Total Score: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Reflective Questions for Grant Reviewer**

Do you have any biases or assumptions that are coming up in your scoring? How should we address these biases or assumptions?

Organizations need to score at least 2 points in each scoring category. Did the organization score at least 2 points for each category?

Do you have any comments, reactions, or questions based on the score thus far?

Does this application need follow up to gain more information for evaluation?

Would you recommend this organization for funding?

- A. Definitely Yes (4)
- B. Leaning Towards Yes (3)
- C. Maybe (2)
- D. Leaning Towards No (1)
- E. Definitely Not (0)

Final Score: \_\_\_\_\_

Yes: 13-16

Needs Further Review: 8-12

No: 0-8