



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 for two main criterions: Community Care and Organizational and Community Participation. For "Community Care," the rubric is broken down to evaluate both the response and impact of organizational activities and programs. This criterion ranges from Unclear (0) - Strong (3). The highest score each organization can achieve in this section is 6.

The second main criterion is for BIPOC and Trans, Nonbinary, Gender Queer, and Two Spirit “Organizational and Community Participation.” Participation means active engagement and leadership throughout all levels of the organization including board, staff, volunteers, and program participants. This criterion ranges from Seedling (0) - Flourishing (4). The highest score each organization can achieve in this section is 8.

Overall, between both sections the highest score an organization can reach is 14. 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 18, and the lowest is 0. We also include a section of “Human Geography” to better understand resource access points (or lack thereof) the organization has w/in their community.

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 eligibility: Yes No

If No, what criteria do they not meet:

- A. Organization is not focused on supporting LGBTQIA2S+ communities in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and/or Washington.
- B. 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) Does the organization meet our priorities? Yes No Kinda

a. If No or Kinda, what criteria do they not meet:

- i. Organization is not QTBIPOC-led and/or focused
- ii. Organization is located in Seattle or Portland
- iii. Organization has a budget over \$750,000 **or** 5 FTE staff or more

- 4) What is the organization's relationship to Pride Foundation?
 - a. The organization is a current Community grantee
 - b. The organization is a previous CCF grantee?
 - c. The organization is a former grantee (pre-2021)?
 - d. The organization is new-to Pride Foundation

Human Geography:

- 1) Does the location they serve have more than one Walmart? Yes No
- 2) Does the location they serve have more than Target? Yes No
- 3) Does the location they serve have one or more Trader Joe's? Yes No
- 4) Does the location they serve have one or more Costco? Yes No
- 5) Does the location they serve have more than one College/University with more than 20,000 students? Yes No

(Any other important information to consider regarding the organization's geographic location? [Short answer response – not required])

Quantitative Rubric: Community Care

CRITERION	STRONG (3)	GOOD (2)	DEVELOPING (1)	UNCLEAR (0)
Response	The organization clearly outlines and details their response to community needs.	The organization somewhat outlines and details their response to community needs.	The organization does not clearly detail their response to community needs.	The organization does not provide enough information to assess the criteria area.

Impact	The intended impacts of the response are clearly specified and described.	Some details of the intended impacts of the response are specified and described.	The intended impacts of the response are not specified or described.	The organization does not provide enough information to assess the criteria area.
---------------	---	---	--	---

Quantitative Rubric: Community Participation and Leadership

CRITERION	FLOURISHING (4)	FLOWERING (3)	DEVELOPING/ UNFURLING (2)	BUDDING (1)	SEEDLING (0)
BIPOC Community Participation and Leadership	The organization has BIPOC participation and leadership in every (~80% or more) aspect of the organization.	The organization has BIPOC participation and leadership in most (60%-79%) aspects of the organization.	The organization has BIPOC participation and leadership in some (~40%-59%) aspects of the organization.	The organization has BIPOC participation and leadership in hardly (~20%-39%) any aspect of the organization.	The organization has little to no (~0%-19%) BIPOC participation and leadership.
Organizational and Community Participation	The organization has trans, nonbinary, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation and leadership in every (~80% or more) aspect of the organization.	The organization has trans, nonbinary, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation and leadership in most (~60%-79%) aspects of the organization.	The organization has trans, gender queer, nonbinary, and Two Spirit participation and leadership in some (~40%-59%) aspects of the organization.	The organization has trans, nonbinary, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation and leadership in hardly (~20%-39%) any aspect of the organization.	The organization has little to no (~0%-19%) trans, nonbinary, gender queer, and Two Spirit participation and leadership.

Community Care Score: _____

Community Participation and Leadership Score: _____

Total Score: _____

Reflective Questions for Grant Reviewer

Is there any additional context needed to better understand the organization and/or their community care practices?

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

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: 14-18

Needs Further Review: 8-13

No: 0-7