

Hartford Foundation for Public Giving Open Door Grant Rubric

ORGANIZATIONAL ASSESSMENT				
	0 (Lowest Score)	1	2	3 (Most favorable)
The organization demonstrates cultural competency/humility, including through the recruitment of staff that are reflective of the community served and/or through staff training.	The organization's staff does not well reflect the community served and it has not shown a commitment to recruiting staff that would reflect the community or providing training in cultural competency for existing staff.	The organization's staff does not well reflect the community served but the organization is committed to recruiting staff to better reflect the community. The organization can also demonstrate cultural competency in other ways (for example, training for staff.)	The organization's staff mostly reflects the community served and the organization is committed to recruiting staff to better reflect the community. The organization can also demonstrate cultural competency in other ways (for example, training for staff.)	The organization's staff well reflects the community served, the organization is committed to retaining staff and/or recruiting staff that are reflective of the community, as needed. The organization can also demonstrate cultural competency in other ways (for example, training for staff.)
The organization serves residents of Greater Hartford.	Under 25 percent of the organization's services are provided within the Foundation's 29-town funding region	Between 25-50 percent of the organization's services are provided within the Foundation's 29-town funding region	Between 50-75 percent of the organization's services are provided within the Foundation's 29-town funding region	Between 75-100 percent of the organization's services are provided within the Foundation's 29-town funding region
The organization can demonstrate successful performance in advancing its mission for a period of at least one year.	The organization is unable to offer any experience where it has made progress towards its mission.	N/A	N/A	The organization can share positive experiences where it has made progress towards its mission.
The organization seeking support is led by a racially/ethnically	No, the nonprofit leader is not a racially/ethnically	N/A	N/A	Yes, the nonprofit leader is a racially/ethnically



under-represented nonprofit leader (Executive Director, CEO or President).	underrepresented leader.			underrepresented leader.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--	--------------------------

REQUEST ASSESSMENT				
	0 (Lowest Score)	1	2	3 (Most favorable)
The proposed work is resident/client driven, including through the engagement of the community served in the design and implementation of the proposed work.	The proposed work has not received input or been informed by the community to be served nor is the community to be served involved in its implementation or asked to provide feedback on the implementation.	The proposed work has been influenced by some community input but there is no mechanism to receive continual input from the community in its implementation.	The design of the proposed work has received some community input and its implementation would be adjusted based on some community input, but the mechanism for ongoing feedback is less robust.	The proposed work has been designed and would be implemented by or with ongoing input from representatives of the community to be served.
The proposed work would address a need (continued or new) and would not duplicate existing efforts by others to address the same need.	The applicant has not demonstrated a need for the proposed work and has not demonstrated knowledge of existing programming that might be duplicative.	Some need for the proposed work has been demonstrated with limited description of how this would relate to existing efforts.	Considerable need for the proposed work has been demonstrated and/or some knowledge of related efforts has been described.	The applicant has demonstrated a clear, strong (continued or new) need for the proposed work and has described how this effort might complement related programming that already exists.
Foundation funding would meaningfully contribute to the organization’s ability to implement proposed activities.	Without Foundation funding, the applicant would be able to use other available funding or resources to move the work forward.	Without Foundation funding, most of the proposed work could move forward but Foundation funding would be helpful.	Without Foundation funding, the proposed work could not move forward as effectively and would be significantly delayed.	Without Foundation funding, the proposed work could not move forward or would be significantly delayed while other funding sources were sought.



<p>The proposed work, as described, could be expected to result in some measurable progress towards the goal of the request.</p>	<p>The measurable change described in the application is unlikely to be achieved through the activities outlined.</p>	<p>There is some chance that the measurable change could result from the activities outlined.</p>	<p>The measurable change described in the application might be achievable through the activities outlined.</p>	<p>The measurable change described in the application seem achievable through the activities outlined.</p>
<p>If more than one year would be needed to advance measurable change through the work, the organization has considered the need and/or has a plan to sustain the effort beyond the grant period.</p>	<p>The applicant has offered no evidence that they have considered the need for sustainability beyond a year.</p>	<p>The applicant has considered the need for sustainability beyond a year but not offered a sustainability plan to support that.</p>	<p>The applicant has outlined a somewhat realistic sustainability plan to continue the work beyond a year.</p>	<p>The applicant has outlined a realistic sustainability plan or provided a clear explanation as to why the effort would not need to be sustained beyond a year.</p>

Criteria by group	Maximum Score
DEI	9
Services/Alignment	6
Capacity/track record	6
Resources	6