

FY 2025-26 Wraparound Services and Stability 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 2025-2026 WRAPAROUND SERVICES AND STABILITY 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: Understanding & Addressing ALICE Challenges Related Questions: PN1 and PN2	Organization provides limited description of barriers facing ALICE households AND they do not provide specific evidence as to how their proposed services address barriers.	Organization provides limited description of barriers facing ALICE households OR they do not provide specific evidence as to how their proposed services address barriers.	Organization provides description of barriers facing ALICE households and connection between the barriers and proposed services, but some details/evidence are vague or unclear.	Organization provides compelling description of barriers facing ALICE households and clear, detailed connection between the barriers and proposed services.	9
3	Program Narrative: Alignment to Fund Intent Related Question: PN2 and PN3	Description of the services does not address multiple conditions AND the narrative does not include evidence that services support participant stability through a wraparound approach. Does not	Description of the services does not address multiple conditions OR the narrative does not include evidence that services support participant stability through a wraparound approach. Alignment to funding intent is limited.	Description of the services address multiple conditions, and the narrative includes examples of how services support participant stability, but the evidence only makes vague or unclear connections to the funding intent and a wraparound services approach.	Description of the services clearly address multiple conditions, and the narrative provides strong examples of how services support participant stability. The evidence provided makes a clear and compelling connection to the funding	9

		demonstrate alignment to funding intent.			intent and a wraparound services approach.	
3	Program Narrative: Community Voice Related Question: PN4	Organization does not provide evidence that demonstrates they center the lived experience and voice of community to understand need and inform programming. There is no evidence that the barriers to ALICE and proposed services are informed by feedback from the community and people with lived experience.	Organization provides evidence that demonstrates their attempt to center the lived experience and voice of community to understand need and inform programming but is not clear if they actually act on it. There is limited connection between the barriers to ALICE, proposed services, and their process for collecting feedback.	Organization provides evidence that demonstrates they center and act on the lived experience and voice of community to understand need and inform programming. Organization makes connection between the barriers to ALICE, proposed services, and their process for collecting feedback, but some of the evidence is vague or unclear.	Organization provides clear and compelling evidence that demonstrates they center and act on the lived experience and voice of community to understand need and inform programming. Organization makes strong connection between the barriers to ALICE, proposed services, and their process for collecting feedback.	9
3	Program Narrative: Care Coordination Related Question: PN5	Organization provides limited description of how it coordinates care AND they do not provide evidence of the operations and partnerships they have in place to connect participants to wraparound resources and referrals.	Organization provides limited description of how it coordinates care OR they do not provide evidence of the operations and partnerships they have in place to connect participants to wraparound resources referrals.	Organization provides description of how it coordinates care, but some details/evidence is vague or unclear. Overall, the argument holds.	Description of how the organization coordinates care is clear and compelling. Specific examples and evidence are provided that show the organization has strong operations and partnerships in place to connect participants to wraparound resources and referrals.	9

2	Program Narrative: Service History/ Experience Related Question: PN6	Organization provides a limited description of their experience providing wraparound services AND they do not include evidence of past results or client success.	Organization provides a limited description of their experience providing wraparound services OR they do not include evidence of past results or client success.	Clear description of the organization's experience providing wraparound services, but the evidence of past results and client success is vague or unclear.	Clear and compelling description of the organization's experience providing wraparound services and strong evidence of past results and client success.	6
1	Target Populations Related Questions: 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	Service Area and Scale Related Questions: SA1, SA2, SA3, and AM1	The estimated number of participants served does not demonstrate the organization's ability to scale services to meet need AND the programming is only offered in one county.		The estimated number of participants served demonstrates the organization's ability to scale services to meet needs OR programming is offered in more than one county.	The estimated number of participants served demonstrates the organization's ability to scale services to meet need AND programming is offered in more than one county.	3
3	ALICE Municipalities Related Questions: AM3	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

1	Measuring Success & Outcomes Related Question: MS1 and MS2	Organization does not describe how it will measure success and what will be achieved as a result of the grant funding. The metric(s) do not align with the proposed services, and they only reflect outputs.	Organization provides limited description of how it will measure success and what will be achieved as a result of the grant funding. There is little alignment between the metric(s) and proposed services. The metric(s) reflect outputs only.	Organization describes how it will measure success and what will be achieved as a result of the grant funding. There is sufficient alignment between the metric(s) and proposed services. The metric(s) provided mostly reflect impact/outcome indicators not just outputs.	Organization clearly describes how it will measure success and what will be achieved as a result of the grant funding. There is strong alignment between the metric(s) and proposed services. The metric(s) provided reflect impact/outcome indicators not just outputs.	3
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
1	Diversification of Funding Related Question: DF1	Organization did not provide evidence that there are additional funding sources to support the proposed services.	Organization provides some evidence that there are additional funding sources to support the proposed services, but		Organization provides strong evidence that there are additional funding sources to support the proposed services.	3

			reviewer has concerns about sustainability.			
3	Overall Application Integrity	Overall, the services proposed, narrative and budget are not aligned. Reviewer does not recommend funding this application.	Application lacked consistency across the services proposed, narrative and budget. Overall, it demonstrated limited alignment to the funding intent.	Most of the application was clear and compelling, but some parts were unclear or confusing. Overall, demonstrated moderate alignment to the funding intent.	Overall application was clear, compelling and consistent and demonstrated strong alignment to the funding priorities. Reviewer highly recommends funding this application.	9
TOTAL POINTS FOR INDIVIDUAL APPLICANTS						81
2	Collaborative Entity: History Working Together Related Questions: CE3 and CE4	Collaborative entity has not been working together for at least 1-year. Collaborative is not eligible to apply.		Collaborative entity has been working together for at least 1-year. Provides some evidence of their previous work together and results so far, but parts are vague or unclear.	Collaborative entity has been working together for at least 1-year and provides clear and compelling evidence of their previous work together and results so far.	6
2	Collaborative Entity: Goal Setting & Impact of Funding Related Question: CE5	Collaborative entity does not describe the impact they will make together or neglects to include short- & long-term goals in their narrative. It is not clear how the funding will help them achieve the desired results.	Collaborative entity provides limited description of the impact they will make together and includes short- or long-term goals in their narrative, but not both. There is little connection made between the funding and desired results.	Collaborative entity describes the impact they will make together and includes short- & long-term goals in their narrative. There is a connection made between the funding and desired results, but parts are vague or unclear.	Collaborative entity provides clear and compelling description of the impact they will make together. They include strong and thoughtful short- & long-term goals and clearly describe how the funding will help them achieve the desired results.	6

3	Collaborative Entity: Roles & Responsibilities Related Questions: CE6 and CE7	Collaborative entity does not describe how they will organize themselves AND they do not describe the roles and responsibilities of each member organization. It is not clear how members will contribute, collaborate and support one another.	Collaborative entity provides limited description of how they will organize themselves OR they do not describe the roles and responsibilities of each member organization. There is little clarity how members will contribute, collaborate and support one another.	Collaborative entity describes how they will organize themselves, but parts are vague or unclear. The roles and responsibilities of each member organization are described and there is some evidence for how they will contribute, collaborate and support one another.	Collaborative entity provides a clear and compelling description of how they will organize themselves to hold each other accountable and achieve results. The roles and responsibilities of each member organization are described, and it is clear how they will contribute, collaborate and support one another.	9
TOTAL POINTS COLLABORATIVE APPLICANTS						102