

**Skokie Community Foundation  
Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric for 2027 Grants**

**Organizations:**

**Requested Award:**

New Project: Y/N, If yes, is scope expanded Y/

<b>To</b>	<input type="text" value="Person"/> <input type="text" value="Person"/> <input type="text" value="Person"/>
<b>Cc</b>	<input type="text" value="Person"/>
<b>Bcc</b>	<input type="text" value="Person"/>
<b>Subject</b>	

**N**

**New Partnership:** Y/N

**New Organization:** Y/N

**Required Nonprofit Status:** At least one organization must be a 501(c)(3).

**Funding Reliance:** Preference will be given to proposals that rely on this grant for the majority of its funding, or where the programming that serves Skokie residents relies primarily on this SCF funding.

**Evaluation Criteria:**

Excellent (4 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Fair (2 Points)	Poor (1 Point)	Weight	Total Possible Points
<b>1. Need &amp; Impact (Skokie Focus)</b>					

Excellent (4 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Fair (2 Points)	Poor (1 Point)	Weight	Total Possible Points
Clearly articulates a significant, well-documented local need in Skokie. Demonstrates a strong understanding of the target population and the proposed project's potential impact.	Identifies a local need in Skokie and outlines the project's potential impact. Some supporting data is provided.	Describes a local need but the connection to Skokie residents or the impact is not fully developed. Limited supporting data.	Fails to clearly identify a local need in Skokie or demonstrate potential impact. No supporting data.	3	12
<b>2. Project Design &amp; Methodology</b>					
Presents a clear, logical and innovative project design with a detailed and feasible methodology. Demonstrates a strong understanding of best practices.	Presents a logical project design with a feasible methodology. Some details may be lacking.	Project design and methodology are somewhat unclear or lack detail. Feasibility is questionable.	Project design and methodology are poorly defined or infeasible.	3	12
<b>3. Roles &amp; Responsibilities (Organizational Capacity)</b>					
Clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of all involved parties, including partners (if applicable). Demonstrates strong organizational capacity and the ability to carry out the project.	Defines roles and responsibilities, but some aspects may be unclear or lack detail. Demonstrates adequate organizational capacity.	Roles and responsibilities are vaguely defined. Organizational capacity is not clearly demonstrated.	Roles and responsibilities are poorly defined or missing. Organizational capacity is doubtful.	2	8
<b>4. Budget &amp; Financial Management (Funding Reliance)</b>					

<b>Excellent (4 Points)</b>	<b>Good (3 Points)</b>	<b>Fair (2 Points)</b>	<b>Poor (1 Point)</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Total Possible Points</b>
<p>Presents a detailed, realistic, and well-justified budget, demonstrating that this grant will provide the majority of the funding. Shows limited or no other sources of income. Demonstrates sound financial management practices. Aligns with grant maximum of \$10,000.</p>	<p>Presents a budget with reasonable justifications, showing this grant will provide a substantial portion of funding. Some details may be lacking regarding other funding sources.</p>	<p>Budget is incomplete or lacks clear justifications. Financial management practices are not clearly demonstrated. Other funding sources are unclear.</p>	<p>Budget is poorly developed, unrealistic, or missing. Demonstrates that this grant is not the main source of income.</p>	3	12

### **5. Evaluation Plan**

<p>Presents a comprehensive and measurable evaluation plan with clear outcomes and indicators. Demonstrates a commitment to accountability and learning.</p>	<p>Presents an evaluation plan with measurable outcomes. Some details may be lacking.</p>	<p>Evaluation plan is vague or lacks measurable outcomes. Commitment to accountability is not clearly demonstrated.</p>	<p>Evaluation plan is poorly defined or missing.</p>	2	8
--	---	---	--	---	---

### **6. Scalability & Sustainability**

<p>Demonstrates a clear plan for scalability and/or sustainability beyond the grant period. Shows potential for long-term impact, despite heavy reliance on this grant.</p>	<p>Addresses scalability or sustainability, but the plan may lack detail.</p>	<p>Mentions scalability or sustainability, but the plan is vague.</p>	<p>Fails to address scalability or sustainability.</p>	1	4
---	---	---	--	---	---

### **7. 501(c)(3) Status (If Applicable)**

Excellent (4 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Fair (2 Points)	Poor (1 Point)	Weight	Total Possible Points
Organization clearly demonstrates valid 501(c)(3) status.	Organization provides documentation indicating 501(c)(3) status, but requires clarification.	Organization claims 501(c)(3) status, but documentation is insufficient.	Organization does not demonstrate 501(c)(3) status.	1	4
<b>8. Partnerships</b>					
New partnership and new opportunity.	New partnership and existing opportunity.	Existing partnership and new opportunity.	Existing partnership and existing opportunity.	1	4

### Scoring:

- **Total Possible Points:** 64
- **Funding Priority:** Priority for funding will go to proposals with the highest score that demonstrate the strongest impact on Skokie residents, address the most pressing local need, AND rely heavily on this grant.
- **Funding Distribution:** Due to the emphasis on primary funding, it is anticipated that the majority of funds will go to the highest scoring proposals.
- **Threshold for Funding:** A minimum score of 45 is recommended for funding consideration.

### Key Changes and Emphases:

- **Criterion 4 (Budget & Financial Management):** This section is heavily weighted (3) to reflect the importance of the project's reliance on this grant. The evaluation will focus on whether the budget clearly shows that this grant is the primary source of funding.
- **Funding Reliance:** Language has been added to multiple sections to reinforce that the grant is intended to be the major source of funding for the proposed project.
- **Threshold:** the minimum score was increased to 45, to reflect the higher standard of a proposal that will be mostly funded by this grant.

This revised rubric ensures that proposals are evaluated not only on their merit and impact but also on their genuine need for this grant as the primary source of funding.