



Question	Scoring Rubric
Local Knowledge	1 — Strongly Disagree: Does not describe the neighborhood's history or current conditions beyond generic language. 2 — Disagree: Names some conditions but shows limited understanding of how they developed or how to shift them. 3 — Agree: Demonstrates solid knowledge of the neighborhood's history and conditions, with a reasonable sense of what change requires. 4 — Strongly Agree: Demonstrates deep, specific knowledge of the neighborhood's history and conditions, with a compelling articulation of what it will take to create change.
Neighborhood Change	1 — Strongly Disagree: Focuses only on outputs or benefits to individual participants; no neighborhood-level outcomes described. 2 — Disagree: Mentions neighborhood-level change, but vaguely, without a clear link to project activities. 3 — Agree: Describes plausible, specific neighborhood-level outcomes connected to the project's work. 4 — Strongly Agree: Makes a compelling, well-reasoned case for how this project will shift neighborhood conditions for everyone who lives there.
Cross-Sector Collaboration and Partnerships	1 — Strongly Disagree: No meaningful partners are named, or relationships appear informal or one-off. 2 — Disagree: Names partners, but the collaboration reads as coordination or referral rather than a shared strategy. 3 — Agree: Describes a real partnership with shared goals across at least two sectors. 4 — Strongly Agree: Describes a well-established, cross-sector partnership explicitly working toward changing neighborhood systems, with clear roles for each partner.
Centering Resident Voice	1 — Strongly Disagree: Residents are only recipients of the program; no evidence of resident input or leadership. 2 — Disagree: Residents are asked for feedback, but the organization retains control over decisions. 3 — Agree: Residents have meaningful input into goals or design, though the organization still leads implementation. 4 — Strongly Agree: Residents hold real decision-making power and leadership roles, and the application shows how that power is growing.
Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL)	1 — Strongly Disagree: No clear measurement plan, or accountability is described only in internal terms. 2 — Disagree: Some measurement plan exists, but reporting or accountability to the neighborhood or partners is unclear. 3 — Agree: Describes a reasonable measurement plan and some form of external reporting or accountability. 4 — Strongly Agree: Describes a robust measurement plan with clear external reporting to the neighborhood and partners, and a real process for adjusting based on results.
Timeline & Vision for the Grant Period	1 — Strongly Disagree: No clear timeline or milestones; vision for year one is vague or missing. 2 — Disagree: Some timeline details, but the vision for the coming year is



	underdeveloped or not clearly connected to the project's goals. 3 — Agree: Presents a reasonable timeline with clear milestones and a believable one-year vision. 4 — Strongly Agree: Presents a clear, well-sequenced timeline and a compelling, specific vision for the project's growth over the next year.
Project Financing and Budget	1 — Strongly Disagree: Vague funding plan; few or no other funds secured. 2 — Disagree: Some funding secured or planned, but the plan to fully fund the project is only partially credible. 3 — Agree: Reasonable funding plan with meaningful funds already secured or committed. 4 — Strongly Agree: Thorough, credible plan to fully fund the project, with ample funds already secured or firmly committed.
Letter of Support	Pass / Fail. Fail if not submitted, or if the letter does not speak to the place-based nature of the project. Pass if the letter clearly demonstrates the project's place-based nature from the supporter's perspective.
Optional Attachments	Not scored. Meant to enhance the application.

Place-Based Efforts

Local Knowledge: A clear, place-specific understanding of the neighborhood, its history, how current conditions came to be, and what it will take to change them. This is what distinguishes genuinely place-based work from services that are simply located in a neighborhood.

Neighborhood Change: The lasting shifts in neighborhood conditions and systems this project is working toward: improvements to the neighborhood itself that benefit everyone who lives there, not only those directly served by the applicant's programming.

Cross-Sector Collaboration and Partnerships: A genuine partnership, with residents, other organizations, businesses, and/or government, built around shared goals and working toward systems-level change in the neighborhood. This is more than routine coordination between organizations that occasionally support one another.

Centering Resident Voice: The leadership, assets, and power of residents drive this work, from identifying problems and setting goals to shaping the project and giving ongoing feedback. This goes beyond collecting feedback; reviewers should look for evidence that resident power and influence are increasing over time.

Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning (MEAL): How the applicant tracks progress, stays accountable to the neighborhood and cross-sector partners, and adjusts its approach based on what it learns, including how it reports both internally and externally.