

## Assessment SPCC 2022 Mini Grant Proposal Review Checklist

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

CHECKLIST COMPLETED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

*To be eligible for review, each proposal must provide the following information:*

Criteria Met (insert X in this column)	CRITERIA
	1. This proposer is a 501c3 organization.
	2. The proposal is in-line with SPCC's core beliefs and values
	3. All required information is included in the proposal:
	a. Name of organization and year started
	b. EIN from IRS determination letter
	c. Person with Signature Authority and Email
	d. Main Contact and Email
	e. Department/Unit
	f. Address
	g. Phone / Fax
	h. Reason for proposal
	i. Website
	j. Mission Statement
	k. Total Number of Employees
	l. Answered all questions
	m. Most recent year-end financial statement actuals vs. budget (MUST include income statement and balance sheet).
	n. Current year-to-date financial statement (actual vs. budget) and balance sheet for the organization.
	o. 2021 (or 2022) organization budget
	p. The budget for your proposed grant application should not exceed \$2,500.
	q. Copy of your IRS 501(c)3 determination letter. Any application that does not contain this information will not be considered.
	r. A list of your board members, including officers.

## Assessment Grant Proposal Review Rubric

PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

RUBRIC COMPLETED BY: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

*Reviewers will complete the rubric to evaluate the quality of each proposal and its alignment with the goals of the assessment grant program.*

	<i>Strong = 2 points</i>	<i>Satisfactory = 1 point</i>	<i>Developing = 0 points</i>	
Criterion	Strong	Satisfactory	Developing	SCORE
<b>Technical aspects:</b> The application is comprehensive, all requirements are met, and, submitted on time for consideration.	The application was filled out with consideration in completing all areas requested in full. Documentation attached is clearly labeled and contains all information requested. A clear understanding outlining the need of the grant. All was turned in on time.	The application was filled out with minimal consideration in all areas requested. Compilation of the documentation attached has adequate information. A sufficient outline for the need of the grant is provided. All was turned in on time.	The application was filled out with little consideration in all areas requested. Attachments were provided with the least possible amount of information. Reason for the need for the grant was not clearly identified. All was turned in on time.	
<b>Serving:</b> The project supports the mission of SPCC, including serving those in Colorado.	The information given supports SPCC's mission, providing a project that has clear details of residence who will be supported in Colorado.	The organization's mission is somewhat in line with SPCC's and the project provides details of who will benefit from the project within Colorado.	The planned action(s) does not directly respond to and is unlikely to be in line with SPCC's commission serving residents within Colorado..	
<b>Budget:</b> The planned expenditures logically support and are necessary for the planned actions, and do not exceed \$2500.00.	The planned expenditures logically support and are necessary for the planned actions. The budget does not exceed \$2500.00.	The planned expenditures might support the planned actions but require more detail or justification. The budget does not exceed \$2500.00.	The planned expenditures do not logically support or are not necessary for the planned actions, or they exceed \$2500.00.	
<b>Collaboration:</b> Multiple stakeholders in the program have an active role in carrying out the proposed project.	Multiple stakeholders in the program have an active role in carrying out the proposed project, thereby increasing its impact.	Multiple stakeholders in the program have agreed to participate but have a limited role in carrying out the proposed project, thereby limiting its impact.	A single stakeholder will carry out the proposed project with limited participation from or impact on other stakeholders in the program.	

*Strong = 2 points*

*Satisfactory = 1 points*

*Developing = 0 points*

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<b>Scope:</b> The project's scope is manageable given the number of participating individuals, their experience with assessment, and the proposed budget.	There are sufficient individuals with appropriate assessment experience or requests for expert support to complete the project with the proposed budget.	There are sufficient individuals but with limited assessment experience or requests for expert support, OR too few individuals, but with appropriate experience to complete the project with the proposed budget	There are too few individuals and limited assessment experience or insufficient/misaligned requests for expert support; it is unlikely they will be able to complete the project with the proposed budget.	
<b>Timeline:</b> The project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	The project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	It will be challenging to complete the project within the grant year's timeline without additional help, expertise in assessment, or funds.	It is unlikely that the project can be completed within the grant year's timeline.	
<b>Organizational Support in the Community:</b> Organizational support and collaboration with other agencies within the community in terms of suicide prevention.	The organization's grant request focuses on suicide prevention serving multiple areas of the communities needs as well as collaborating with other agencies.	The organizations focus is on suicide prevention in minimal areas supporting the community.	Very minimal people in the community will be impacted from this grant request.	

**SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION**

<p><b>Recommendation for funding:</b> Based on the above elements together, the project is likely to achieve its stated goals for promoting best practices in assessment within the grant period.</p>	<p><b>Fund this proposal:</b> Most elements received a "Strong" rating; any elements with a "Satisfactory" rating can be easily improved. (Add feedback below.)</p>	<p><b>Consider this proposal:</b> Some elements were rated "Strong," but others were rated "Satisfactory," indicating some areas that need further development. With feedback, the proposers could improve the project plan.</p>	<p><b>Do not fund this proposal in its current form:</b> The proposal does not align with the assessment grant program's goals, or several of the elements above were rated as "Developing." With feedback, the proposers could revise their project plan for consideration in future grant cycles.</p>	<p><b>TOTAL SCORE</b></p>
---	---	--	---	---------------------------

**Feedback to proposers:**

---

---

---

---