



Grant program: Responsive Grants
Review team & reviewer initials:

Applicant organization:

The applicant has been vetted for basic grant eligibility. This evaluation tool is meant to ensure that all review team members are evaluating the same criteria. Scores are not meant to produce rankings based upon numerical scores. This tool is meant to offer a beginning context for discussion. Grant Review Teams are asked to bring your completed printouts to the team meeting.

APPLICATION EVALUATION

Based on the organization's application responses, please rate the following statements. The maximum points allowed for the evaluation criterion are listed at the end of each statement. Refer to the corresponding application questions and the self-reported data in the organization's LIVEGIVEmidsouth.org profile.	
	The nonprofit's programs align with its mission. (5 points)
	The organization clearly describes its core programs or services and how they address the most pressing needs of the communities served, including any recent adaptations that have strengthened community connection and impact. (25 points)
	The organization demonstrates it is facing significant threats such as funding cuts, harmful policy changes, increased scrutiny, or exclusion from public and philanthropic investment and clearly articulates the potential impact of these threats on its work and community. (25 points)
	The organization's leadership, staff, and decision-making processes reflect and engage the communities served. The organization elevates the stories, perspectives, or lived experiences of communities that are often overlooked or erased in the public sphere. (25 points)
	The funding request aligns with the purpose of this grant round and has the potential to meaningfully support the organization's stability and ability to meet urgent or evolving needs. (20 points)
	GRAND TOTAL (out of 100)
COMMENTS:	

Please make notes for Community Foundation staff to share with applicants. (Your comments are anonymous.) Feedback helps reviewers eliminate bias in our evaluations because we can articulate why we scored the way we did. Additionally, it can be an important part of building capacity for nonprofits. Are there details that should have been included in the application that were not? Were there elements of the application that gave you doubts? What other useful information should be shared with the applicant?