

UNITED WAY GREATER RICHMOND AND PETERSBURG - RICHMOND THRIVES GRANTS PROGRAM EVALUATION RUBRIC

Category	Points	What Reviewers Will Assess	Does Not Meet Our Expectations	Meets Most of Our Expectations	Exceeds Our Expectations
1. Strategic Fit and Funding Alignment	20	The proposal clearly aligns with the selected priority area, goals, and sub-focus areas.	The proposal does not clearly align with the selected priority area or does not demonstrate a meaningful connection to the stated goals or sub-focus areas. The work may appear better suited for another funding source, another priority area, or may include activities that are restricted or excluded.	The proposal generally aligns with the selected priority area and identifies a relevant goal or sub-focus area. The connection is understandable, but some details may be broad, unclear, or not fully developed.	The proposal clearly and strongly aligns with the selected priority area, goals, and sub-focus areas. The activities, population served, and intended results directly reflect the purpose of the priority area.
2. Target Population and Geographic Benefit	10	The proposal directly and primarily benefits City of Richmond residents and identifies who will be served.	The proposal does not clearly show that City of Richmond residents are the direct and primary beneficiaries. The applicant provides limited or unclear information about who will be served, where services will occur, or how Richmond residency will be tracked.	The proposal appears to benefit City of Richmond residents and provides a reasonable description of the population, location, or community served. Some details about tracking, outreach, or primary benefit may need clarification.	The proposal clearly identifies City of Richmond residents as the direct and primary beneficiaries. The applicant describes who will be served, where they will be served, how residents will be reached, and how Richmond residency or participation will be tracked.
3. Community Need, Equity and Access	20	The proposal addresses a clear need, gap, or barrier and reflects community voice, equity, or lived experience.	The proposal does not clearly describe the need, gap, or barrier being addressed. The equity connection is weak, missing, or too general, and there is little evidence that community voice, participant experience, or lived experience informed the work.	The proposal describes a relevant community need, gap, or barrier and includes some connection to equity, access, community input, or participant experience. The explanation is reasonable but may need more specificity.	The proposal clearly describes a specific need, gap, or barrier affecting Richmond residents and explains why it matters. The proposed work is shaped by community voice, participant experience, lived experience, partner feedback, or data, and demonstrates a clear equity focus.
4. Program Design and Implementation Feasibility	15	The proposed activities are clear, realistic, ready to implement, and connected to the stated need.	The proposed activities are unclear, incomplete, or not realistic within the grant period. The application does not provide enough detail about what will happen, who will carry it out, where services will occur, or whether the project is ready to begin.	The project design is generally clear and appears feasible. The applicant describes the major activities, service approach, and readiness level, though some details about timeline, staffing, partners, or implementation may need clarification.	The project design is clear, realistic, and ready to implement. The applicant explains what will happen, who will be served, who will carry out the work, where activities will occur, and how the work can be completed successfully within the grant period.
5. Results, Learning and Measurement	15	The applicant identifies reasonable outputs, outcomes, or indicators and explains how progress will be tracked.	The proposal does not identify clear outputs, outcomes, indicators, or a realistic way to measure success. Proposed results may be vague, overly broad, disconnected from the activities, or not measurable within the grant period.	The proposal identifies reasonable outputs and outcomes that generally connect to the proposed work. The applicant provides some information about how progress will be tracked, but targets or data collection methods may need more detail.	The proposal identifies clear, appropriate, and measurable outputs and outcomes. The applicant selects indicators that fit the work, provides realistic targets, and explains how data will be collected, tracked, and reported.
6. Budget and Resource Stewardship	10	The requested amount is reasonable and connected to the proposed work.	The budget is missing, unclear, incomplete, or not well connected to the proposed activities. Costs may appear unreasonable, unsupported, duplicative, or difficult to assess based on the information provided.	The budget is generally reasonable and connected to the proposed work. Most costs are understandable, though some line items, amounts, or other funding sources may need clarification.	The budget is clear, reasonable, and directly aligned with the proposed activities. The requested amount is appropriate for the scope of work, number of residents served, and expected outcomes. No obvious duplication or allowability concerns are evident.

7. Organizational Capacity and Readiness	10	The applicant has the staffing, experience, partnerships, and basic systems needed to manage the grant and reporting.	The applicant does not demonstrate sufficient readiness to carry out the proposed work or manage grant requirements. Staffing, partnerships, experience, reporting capacity, or grant management responsibilities are unclear or underdeveloped.	The applicant appears generally able to carry out the work and manage the grant. The organization has some relevant experience, staffing, partnerships, or systems in place, though some technical assistance or clarification may be needed.	The applicant demonstrates strong readiness to implement the project and manage grant requirements. The organization has relevant experience, appropriate staffing or partnerships, a clear grant lead, and the ability to meet reporting, documentation, and compliance expectations.
Total	100				

Rubric Point Value	Does Not Meet	Meets Most	Exceeds
20-point category	0–9	10–17	18–20
15-point category	0–7	8–13	14–15
10-point category	0–4	5–8	9–10