Agency Impact Grant Rubric

	(y)	(n)
Is applicant agency a Community Action Agency in the state of IN?		
Is the Cover Sheet and Certification completed correctly and contain ALL required information?		
Does the application overall describe ONE project the respondent intends to undertake? (if unclear or proposing 2 or more unique projects be completed with the funds, answer 'no')		
Is the proposed project intended to rectify a deficiency from the agency's CAR review?		
Is the project described something that another funder should naturally pay for under their contract/award and/or something that is required by another funder?		
Is the respondent intending to use the funds to purchase a database system?		
Are the scores for any of the cells below that are green marked as (1)?		
Are documents submitted as appendices relevant to the application?		

*if any answers above are in orange cells please stop scoring here.

	(1)	(3)	(5)
	Program/Project Description		
1	Project is not something that can be addressed within the agency. (i.e. they are trying to change partner or client behavior rather than agency processes/systems/or behavior)	Project addresses an agency need, but it is not described well, and the agency seems to be putting too much emphasis on others rather than internally on themselves.	Proposed project addresses an agency-level need (not family or community) and the anticipated change will take place *within* the agency.
2	The project description indicates that the agency has not thoroughly thought through what is needed to make this project successful.	The project idea makes sense, but the description of the project's implementation and impact misses key components or key individuals/departments that would need to be involved.	The agency has a clear & complete idea of what the project entails and what pieces of the agency it will affect.
3	Key parties were left out of the decision-making process. The decision to apply for this grant was made by just one of two people, and no one affected by the project seems to have been consulted.	The description indicates that the agency put some thought into the project they were applying for, and included most of the affected parties. The description may be less than clear, or it may look like the parties	The project description clearly indicates how the agency decided to undertake this project; and all appropriate parties were involved, including the board.

		didn't have much say, but were at least involved before the application went in.	
4	The activities described as part of the project likely will not lead to the outcome/change the agency is hoping to have.	The activities make some sense given the stated goal, but the response doesn't clearly link the activities to the goals, and some activities don't seem to directly align.	The activities the agency plans to undertake as part of the project will clearly lead to the stated goal(s) of the project.
5	The activities described as part of the project will likely **not** lead to any actual change in the agency.	The activities described may lead to short term changes for the agency, but likely will not change anything fundamental that will affect how the agency operates/provides services.	The plan for the activities that will be conducted as part of this project suggests that the project will yield a robust and successful change for the agency.
6	The plan provided does not seem possible given the description of where the agency is now or the agency describes an unwillingness or reticence to change.	The plan described may be possible given where the agency is, but would be an uphill battle, and it may not actually work given how far it is from the agency's current operations.	The plan for implementing the change seems possible given the description of where the agency is at now. I.e. the agency seems ready for and open to this type of change
	Statement of Program Theory		
7	Statement is incoherent, unclear, or focuses on the *need* for the project rather than on its potential effectiveness.	Statement focuses on the potential effectiveness of the project but does not clearly describe how the steps/actions taken will lead to the intended outcome of the project.	Statement provides a clear and compelling argument that the project the respondent intends to undertake will achieve the intended outcome.
8	Statement contains little or no research or data or is solely anecdotal.	The research or data cited in the statement either (1) does not seem pertinent to the project, or (2) does not relate to the changes the project intends to incite.	The research or data cited in the statement directly relates to and is relevant for the project being proposed.
	Project Management Plan and Timeline		
9	It is difficult/impossible to follow the plan or timeline. The format and items included don't make sense or don't align with the program description.	The management plan and timeline make some sense given what we learned about the project in the description, but don't seem to be well laid-out. This section doesn't make sense on its own.	Plan and timeline are clear and well-thought through. The tasks are in logical order, the descriptions make sense and it's obvious who is doing what.

10	The timeline does not seem reasonable, items listed are either significantly rushed (not given enough time) or simple items that shouldn't take long are drawn out for no apparent reason.	Timeline seems possible, but there are some concerns about a few missing details or some potentially unreasonable assumptions.	The timeline for the project seems possible given the intensity of the work scheduled.
11	The management plan puts little thought into what kind of staff time, activities or other resources might be necessary to implement the project. There is not a clear plan for how things will get done.	Some detail provided on the personnel, activities, and resources to be used, but there are concerns about ability to implement program based on description.	The management plan shows a clear and thoughtful description the personnel, activities and resources needed to implement the program.
12	Little or no detail provided on staff and/or consultants that will be managing/leading project; it is unclear who will be managing the project.	It is clear who will be managing/leading the project and their qualifications are provided, but their qualifications or capacity may not meet project needs.	The plan for staffing and/or consultants suggests that the personnel involved have adequate qualifications and time(capacity) to appropriately implement the project
13	The plan only mentions a few decision-makers in the agency and does not include key players to implement the change on a long-term or system-wide basis.	The plan seems to have the right people involved, but it is not well-described, and people may not know their roles/responsibilities from looking at the plan.	The individuals working on the project are right for the change the agency is trying to make. No one integral is left out of the plan.
	Budget Template		
14	The project is completely unrealistic given the proposed budget	The budget seems somewhat unrealistic, or like it's missing some items that would be needed for the project.	The project described is do-able within the confines of the budget
15	Line items do not match project description or management plan	Lines items seem mostly proportional to the work described in the project description	Line items are proportional to the work described in the program/project description
	Project Lifespan Description		
16	There is no reasonably implementable plan for gathering information about the changes achieved by this project.	There is a sustainability plan that states that the agency wants to maintain what its learned from the project, but doesn't identify how or by whom this will be done.	Sustainability plan describes how the agency plans to document and sustain the changes achieved by this project, including who will be responsible for those changes long-term.

	Overall		
17	The project is not generalizable enough to yield lessons that will be applicable to any other network agency.	Lessons learned from this project may be applicable to an agency or two, but not widely use-able across the network.	The project may provide valuable lessons for the network, i.e. what this agency learns from the project may be adaptable to other agencies.
18	The project is good for the agency, but likely will not lead to any future projects and will likely not directly improve family/community outcomes once implemented.	The project may lead to future family or community impact, but there are multiple steps before then, and/or it is possible, but not likely the agency wants to build upon it.	The project is likely to lead to a future fam/community impact project, or will clearly improve fam/comty outcomes for existing programs.
19	This project may be good for the organization but likely won't lead to much noticeable affect for low-income program participants.	This would likely yield positive impact for low-income families, but the agency does not seem to have taken that into consideration when deciding to undertake the project.	This project is likely to positively affect low-income families if implemented. The response shows that the agency considered this project's affects on its low-income clients as a key reason they chose to complete this work.
20	This is something the agency likely should have done many years ago; the agency is "behind the times" and trying to catch up.	This is not novel, but would definitely help the agency get to the next level of operations.	This is something cutting-edge; the agency is thinking ahead and preparing for their future.