

IOLTA GRANT EVALUATION RUBRIC

| Criteria | Superior (9 – 10) | Excellent (7 – 8) | Average (5 – 6) | Fair (3 – 4) | Ineffective (1 – 2) |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| <i>Organizational Information</i> | The organization’s mission is strongly aligned with the goals and priorities of the grant; Strong evidence of history, capacity, and experience to manage the program or project. | The organization’s mission aligns well with the goals and priorities of the grant; Mostly has the history, capacity, and experience to manage the program or project. | The organization’s mission has some alignment with the goals and priorities of the grant; Some evidence of history, capacity, and experience to manage the program or project. | The organization’s mission has limited alignment with the goals and priorities of the grant; Limited evidence of history, capacity, and experience to manage the program or project. | The organization’s mission little to no alignment with the goals and priorities of the grant; Little to no evidence of history, capacity, and experience to manage the program or project. |
| <i>Need</i> | The need is clearly defined, specific, compelling, and well supported by evidence. The need is necessary and timely, and the proposal conveys why immediate action is critical. | The need is mostly defined, somewhat specific and compelling with some supporting evidence. The need is mostly necessary and timely, and the proposal conveys why action is needed. | The need is somewhat unclear and compelling with little supporting evidence. The need is somewhat necessary and timely, and the proposal conveys a few reasons why action is needed. | The need is vague, not very compelling, and lacks sufficient evidence. The need is implied by not well articulated, and the proposal doesn’t clearly explain why action is needed. | The need is poorly defined, unconvincing, and not supported by the evidence. Little to no indication of the urgency or timeliness of the need or why action is needed. |
| <i>Target Population</i> | Proposal clearly identifies a specific and well-defined target population. Population aligns with the goals and priorities of the grant. The program/project demonstrates that activities are tailored to serve the population. The number of people served is realistic, well-supported, and align with organizational capacity. | The target population is identified and generally well-defined. The population mostly aligns with the grant’s priorities. The program/project design considers the population served but may lack some detail. Numbers served are mostly realistic, somewhat supported, and somewhat aligned with organizational capacity. | The target population is identified but not well-defined. Some alignment with grant priorities is evident, but not clearly articulated. Program/project design shows limited adaptation to the target population. Includes approximate numbers served, though may lack full clarity or justification. | The target population is vaguely defined or too broad. There is minimal alignment with grant goals. The program/project design does not demonstrate clear consideration of target population. Unclear or missing estimates of numbers served. | The proposal does not clearly identify the target population. The population does not clearly align with the goals of the grant. The program/project lacks specificity to the target population. Little to no mention of how many people will be served. |
| <i>Goals & Objectives</i> | Goals and objectives are exceptionally clear, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). Goals well-aligned with funding priorities and fully support the proposed project’s purpose and outcomes. | Goals and objectives are clear and measurable, with minor weaknesses in specificity or relevance. They generally align with the funding priorities and support the project’s outcomes effectively. | Goals and objectives are stated but may lack clarity, specificity, or measurability. Alignment with funding priorities is acceptable but not strong. Some objectives may not be realistic or time bound. | Goals and objectives are vague or overly broad. They lack clear metrics or timelines. Alignment with the funding priorities is weak or unclear. | Goals and objectives are poorly defined or missing. They are not measurable or achievable and show little or no connection to the project purpose or funding priorities. |

| Criteria | Superior (9 – 10) | Excellent (7 – 8) | Average (5 – 6) | Fair (3 – 4) | Ineffective (1 – 2) |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| <i>Program/Project Description</i> | The description of the program/project is compelling and provides exceptionally detailed information. The description of the work to be completed is very clear and concise. | The description of the program/project is thorough and realistic. The description of the work to be completed is mostly clear and concise. | The description of the program/project is mostly clear with some detailed information. The description of the overall work to be completed is adequate. | The description of the program/project is somewhat clear but includes limited detailed information. The description of the overall work to be completed lacks depth and/or feasibility. | The description of the program/project is vague or unclear. The description of the overall work to be completed poorly defined and/or lacks details. |
| <i>Staffing</i> | Staff have highly relevant qualifications and extensive experience aligned with program/project goals. Roles and responsibilities are clearly defined. | Staff have mostly relevant qualifications and experience aligned with program/project goals. Roles and responsibilities are mostly defined. | Staff have relevant qualifications and adequate experience aligned with program/project goals. Roles and responsibilities are somewhat defined. | Some staff have relevant qualifications, but overall experience is limited and/or not aligned with program or project goals. Roles and responsibilities vaguely defined. | Staff lack relevant qualifications and/or experience with program/project goals. Roles and responsibilities are unclear. |
| <i>Evaluation</i> | Evaluation plan is clear, detailed, and aligns with program/project goals and objectives. | Evaluation plan is mostly clear and aligns with program/project goals and objectives. | Evaluation plan is generally clear but lacks some detail. | Evaluation plan is vague or only partially aligns with program/project goals and objectives. | Evaluation plan is unclear and/or not aligned with program/project goals and objectives. |
| <i>Budget & Financials</i> | Budget is clearly itemized and fully justified; all expenses are reasonable, necessary, and aligned with program/project goals. Demonstrates efficient use of funds and leverages other funding or in-kind support. Budget fully aligns with grant priorities. Applicant demonstrates a clear plan for sustaining the project beyond the grant period. | Budget is mostly itemized and justified; most expenses are reasonable, necessary, and aligned with program/project goals. Demonstrates good use of funds and includes some other funding or in-kind support. Budget mostly aligns with grant priorities. Applicant demonstrates a mostly clear plan for future sustainability. | Budget items are justified and aligned with program/project goals, with some minor gaps or inconsistencies. Demonstrates mostly good use of funds and is generally cost-effective with minor inefficiencies. Budget some minor deviations from grant priorities. Applicant demonstrates an adequate plan for future sustainability. | Some budget items are unclear or not fully with program/project goals; justification lacks detail or relevance. Demonstrates moderate cost-effectiveness, some resources may be over or under allocated. Budget somewhat misaligned with grant priorities or includes questionable expenses. Applicant demonstrates limited plan for future sustainability. | Budget lacks justification or includes inappropriate or unexplained costs. Poor use of funds; lacks value or appears wasteful. Budget fully aligns with grant priorities. Budget misaligned with grant priorities or violates funding restrictions. Applicant demonstrates a weak plan for future sustainability. |

IOLTA GRANT EVALUATION SCORESHEET

Applicant _____

Evaluator _____

| Criteria | Score | Comments |
|------------------------------------|-------|----------|
| <i>Organizational Information</i> | | |
| <i>Need</i> | | |
| <i>Target Population</i> | | |
| <i>Goals & Objectives</i> | | |
| <i>Program/Project Description</i> | | |
| <i>Staffing</i> | | |
| <i>Evaluation</i> | | |
| <i>Budget & Financials</i> | | |
| TOTAL | | |

Received audit and management letter.

Yes

No

Is there a clean opinion and management letter with no findings?

Yes

No

Program/Project strengths and weaknesses

Received funding for current grant year?

Yes No

If "yes," has the applicant demonstrated that the current year funding is being utilized effectively and/or as originally requested and granted?

Would you recommend the program/project for funding?

Yes No