

**Livingston County United Way
Community Investment Grant Application
Scoring Rubric**

Alignment with LCUW Priorities

Does the program clearly align with at least one of LCUW's Impact Areas (Healthy Community, Youth Opportunity, Financial Security, Community Resiliency)?

- 1 - Minimal or No alignment
- 3 - Some alignment but not clearly articulated
- 5 - Strongly aligned with at least one

Score:

Program Impact *Score one of the following questions.*

For Established Programs: Does the program demonstrate meaningful or steady growth in the number of individuals served or adequately explain why numbers have not increased?

- 1 - No growth in number of individuals served with no explanation as to why
- 3 - Little to no growth in individuals served. Has explanation as to why
- 5 - Number of individuals served steadily increases year over year

Score:

For New Programs: Does the application show that the program is designed to continually increase the number of individuals served, and is there a clear plan and system for measuring and tracking that growth over time?

- 1 - No clear plan for growth and no system to track impact.
- 3 - Some plan for growth or a basic tracking system, but lacking detail.
- 5 - Clear plan for growth with a defined system to track impact.

Score:

Program Need

Does the application clearly describe the community need using relevant local data and explain how the program addresses it?

- 1 - Vague or unsupported description of need
- 3 - General explanation of need, with limited or no local data
- 5 - Uses local data, statistics and clear explanation of need and clearly explains how the program addresses needs.

Score:

Target Population

Does the program clearly identify and intentionally serve ALICE or other priority populations in Livingston County?

- 1 - Minimal or unclear focus on ALICE/priority groups
- 3 - Some attention to ALICE or vulnerable populations, but not central to program design
- 5 - Clearly serves ALICE/priority populations in Livingston County with strong justification

Score:

Goals and Objectives

Are the program goals and objectives clearly defined and measurable?

- 1 - Goals are unclear and/or objectives are missing
- 3 - Goals and objectives are present but not measurable
- 5 - Goals are clearly stated and objectives are measurable

Score:

Metrics

Are meaningful and realistic metrics identified to measure program success?

- 1 - Metrics/measurable outcomes not provided
- 3 - Metrics are vague or difficult to measure
- 5 - Metrics are realistic and meaningful

Score:

Collaboration

Does the program demonstrate active collaboration with partners that strengthens impact or service delivery?

- 1 - No evidence of collaboration
- 3 - Some collaboration but limited scope or unclear impact
- 5 - Strong evidence of collaboration with multiple partners; roles are clearly defined

Score:

Financial Strength and Sustainability

Is the program budget detailed, reasonable, and supported by sufficient and diverse funding to ensure program sustainability?

- 1 - Budget unclear or unrealistic
- 3 - Budget is somewhat clear; limited detail on sustainability or external support
- 5 - Budget is clear, reasonable, and leverages multiple funding sources; variances well explained

Score:

Does the application clearly explain how LCUW funds will be used and show that the planned expenses align with the program's goals and activities?

- 1 - Unclear on how funds will be utilized
- 3 - Some understanding of how funds will be utilized but lacks detail or connection to activities
- 5 - Clearly accounted for how LCUW dollars will be used to support program goals

Score:

Overall Quality of Application

Is the application complete, clear, and compelling?

- 1 - Application is incomplete, unclear, or difficult to follow
- 3 - Application is complete but missing clarity in some areas
- 5 - Application is thorough, well-written, and compelling

Score:

Total Score:

Questions to have Agency Representative answer during Panel Presentation:

**Livingston County United Way
Community Investment Grant Presentation
Scoring Rubric**

Additional Detail Beyond Application

Did the presentation provide new or deeper detail beyond what was written in the application?

- 1 - No additional detail provided; application was simply re-stated.
- 3 - Some additional detail provided, but program activities, need, or use of funds remains unclear.
- 5 - Additional detail provided that clarified program activities, need, and use of funds.

Score:

Responsiveness to Questions

Did the presenter fully and clearly answer questions from reviewers?

- 1 - Presenter avoided or could not answer questions.
- 3 - Presenter answered some questions but not fully.
- 5 - Presenter answered questions thoroughly and confidently, providing useful details.

Score:

Storytelling / Real-Life Examples of Impact

Did the presentation provide meaningful examples, stories, or data that clearly illustrate the program's impact on participants or the community?

- 1 - No specific examples, stories, or impact data were shared. Presentation remained general or abstract.
- 3 - Some examples or data were provided, but they were limited, unclear, or did not fully connect to program outcomes.
- 5 - Clear, compelling stories or data were shared that highlighted the program's outcomes and impact on individuals or the community. These examples reinforced why the program matters.

Score:

Total Score:

Exceeding Expectations	55-65
Meeting Expectations	40-54
Needs Improvement	30-39
Inadequate	0-29

Comments (specify if internal or should be shared with agency):

