

FY 2025-26 Community Access and Response Fund

Scoring Rubric

The Scoring Rubric contains the criteria used by reviewers when assessing an application. Applications are scored using criteria where each section of the grant is worth a pre-determined number of points.

FY 2025-26 COMMUNITY ACCESS AND RESPONSE FUND SCORING RUBRIC						
Weight	Scoring Category	Poor- Does Not Satisfy Requirements	Fair: Satisfies Some Requirements	Good Satisfies Most Requirements	(Excellent: Satisfies All Requirements	Total Points
3	Program Narrative: Addressing Community Need Related Questions: PN1, PN2 and PN3	Organization provides limited description of community need AND they do not provide specifics as to how their proposed services address the need.	Organization provides limited description of community need OR they do not provide specifics as to how their proposed services address the need.	Organization provides description of community need and connection between the need and the proposed services, but some details/evidence are vague or unclear.	Organization provides compelling description of community need and clear, detailed connection between the need and proposed services.	9
3	Program Narrative: Alignment to Fund Intent Related Question: PN 1 and PN3	Description of the services do not align with the selected priority area(s) AND the narrative does not include evidence that services meet immediate needs aligned to the funding intent.	Description of the services do not align with the selected priority area(s) OR the narrative does not include evidence that services meet immediate needs aligned to the funding intent.	Description of the services align with the selected priority area(s) and the narrative describes how the services meet immediate needs, but the evidence only makes vague or unclear connections to the funding intent.	Description of the services clearly align with the selected priority area(s) and the narrative describes how the services meet immediate needs. The evidence provided makes a clear and compelling connection to the funding intent.	9

2	Program Narrative: Service History/Experience Related Question: PN4	Organization provides limited description of their experience providing the proposed services AND they do not include evidence of service quality or success in meeting immediate needs.	Organization provides limited description of their experience providing the proposed services OR they do not include evidence of service quality or success in meeting immediate needs.	Clear description of the organization's experience providing the services proposed, but the evidence of quality and success in meeting the immediate needs is vague or unclear.	Clear and compelling description of the organization's experience in providing the proposed services and strong evidence of quality and success in meeting immediate needs.	6
3	Program Narrative: Access and Barrier Busting Related Question: PN5	Organization does not demonstrate how they promote access as part of the proposed services AND provides no relevant barriers and/or the ways they work to reduce those barriers to access.	Organization provides limited description of how they promote access and reduce barriers to service delivery, and description lacks specific examples of relevant barriers and/or the ways they work to reduce those barriers to access.	Clear description of how the organization promotes access and reduces barriers to service delivery, but examples of relevant barriers and/or the ways they work to reduce those barriers to access are vague or unclear.	Clear and compelling description of how the organization promotes access and reduces barriers to service delivery. Organization identifies specific and relevant barriers and provides strong examples of the ways they work to reduce and/or remove those barriers to access.	9
1	Program Narrative: Target Population Related Question: TP1, TP2, TP3, TP4, TP5, and TP6	Organization does not target any of the priority populations that disproportionately fall below the ALICE threshold.		Organization indicates that they target one of the priority populations that disproportionately fall below the ALICE threshold.	Organization indicates that they target two or more of the priority populations that disproportionately fall below the ALICE threshold.	3
1	Individuals Impacted	The estimated number of participants served is		The estimated number of participants served is	The estimated number of participants served is	3

	Related Questions: II1, II2, and II3	limited and does not align with the dollars requested, scope of programming, or intent of the opportunity to meet community need.		moderate and demonstrates some alignment with the dollars requested, scope of programming and intent of the opportunity to meet community need.	significant and strongly demonstrates alignment with the dollars requested, scope of programming and intent of the opportunity to meet community need.	
3	ALICE Municipalities Related Questions: SA3	The estimated percentage of participants that will be served through this grant who reside in municipalities with a large ALICE population is less than 25% .	The estimated percentage of participants that will be served through this grant who reside in municipalities with a large ALICE population is 25% .	The estimated percentage of participants that will be served through this grant who reside in municipalities with a large ALICE population is 50% .	The estimated percentage of participants that will be served through this grant who reside in municipalities with a large ALICE population is 75% or more .	9
3	Budget Integrity: Alignment to Proposed Scope of Work Related Questions: Budget, B1, and B2	Budget is not consistent with the scope of work and overall lacks details and connection between the line-item expenditures and the proposed services.	Budget is somewhat consistent with the scope of work and detail is filled out in only a few categories. The budget narrative is limited and makes little connection between the line-item expenditures and the proposed services.	Budget is consistent with the scope of work and detail is filled out and clear for most budget categories. The budget narrative describes some connection between the line-item expenditures and the proposed services, but parts are vague or unclear.	Budget is consistent with the scope of work and detail is filled out and clear for every budget category. The budget narrative clearly describes the connection between the line-item expenditures and the proposed services.	9
3	Overall Application Integrity	Overall, the services proposed, narrative and budget do not align with the funding intent.	Application lacked consistency across the services proposed, narrative and budget.	Most of the application was clear and compelling, but some parts were unclear or confusing. Overall	Overall application was clear, compelling and consistent and demonstrated strong alignment to the	9

		Reviewer does not recommend funding this application.	Overall demonstrated limited alignment to the funding intent.	demonstrated moderate alignment to the funding intent.	funding priorities. Reviewer highly recommends funding this application.	
TOTAL POINTS FOR INDIVIDUAL APPLICANTS						66