

## Neighborhood Sustainability Grants: Scoring Rubric

Feel free to email the Sustainability Commission at [sustainability@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:sustainability@flagstaffaz.gov) with any questions about the scoring rubric or how your grant application will be evaluated. Applications meeting all requirements and receiving the highest scores will receive funding.

<p><b>Application Completion &amp; Clarity</b></p> <p>0-2 points possible</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>The application contains all information necessary for the Sustainability Commission to make an informed decision on funding the proposed project. This information is easy to find and understand.</p>	<p><b>1 point</b></p> <p>The application is missing a few key details for the Sustainability Commission to make an informed decision on funding the project; and/or the application is organized in a manner that makes some information unnecessarily difficult to find or understand.</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>The application does not provide adequate information for the sustainability commission to understand the project or make an informed decision about it, and/or the application is generally difficult to understand.</p>	
<p><b>Budget / Feasibility / Schedule</b></p> <p>0-4 points possible</p>	<p><b>4 points</b></p> <p>All aspects of the project are realistically possible to accomplish within the budget and schedule (12-month timeframe). The budget contains only items that are strictly necessary for the success of the project. Whenever possible, items are ethically and sustainably sourced. (e. g., limit single-use plastics, focus on locally sourced items when possible, etc.)</p>	<p><b>3 points</b></p> <p>There are minor concerns about the feasibility of some aspects of completing the project within the budget and schedule given, but the overall project still seems realistic and feasible, and/or the budget contains items that may not be strictly necessary for the project's completion.</p>	<p><b>2 points</b></p> <p>There is a substantial risk that the project may not be successfully completed; and/or the budget or schedule is missing important details; and/or the budget contains some items that appear superfluous or wasteful, and/or some items may not align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan.</p>	<p><b>0-1 points</b></p> <p>The project appears unrealistic; and/or the budget or schedule are difficult to understand or missing; and/or the majority of the budget is composed of many items that appear superfluous or wasteful or do not align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan.</p>
<p><b>Conformity with the Overarching Goals of the program- must score an average of 3 or higher to receive funding</b></p> <p><i>Goals: #1- facilitating volunteer engagement or management, #2- building community partnerships, and #3- meaningfully involving underserved communities, diverse groups, or vulnerable populations</i></p> <p>0-5 points possible</p>	<p><b>5 points</b></p> <p>The project clearly and directly aligns with all three of the overarching grant goals. Applicants specifically state how project activities will aid in achieving these goals.</p>	<p><b>3-4 points</b></p> <p>The project clearly and directly aligns with two of the three grant goals and may indirectly align with the third. Applicants specifically state how the project activities will aid in achieving two goals.</p>	<p><b>1-2 points</b></p> <p>The project clearly and directly aligns with one of the three grant goals or may indirectly align with multiple goals. Key information is missing about how project activities are aligned with achieving the goal(s).</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>The project does not directly or indirectly align with any of the overarching grant goals.</p>
<p><b>Conformity with objectives specific to this Category - must score an average of 3 or higher to receive funding</b></p> <p>A complete list of category-specific objectives can be found on the grant website and in the grant guidelines.</p> <p>0-5 points possible</p>	<p><b>5 points</b></p> <p>The project clearly and directly aligns with all three of the Category Objectives for the chosen category (each category has its own objectives listed in the grant announcement). Applicants specifically state how project activities will aid in achieving these objectives.</p>	<p><b>3-4 points</b></p> <p>The project clearly and directly aligns with two of the three Category Objectives and may indirectly align with the third. Applicants specifically state how the project activities will aid in achieving two goals.</p>	<p><b>1-2 points</b></p> <p>The project clearly and directly aligns with one of the three Category Objectives or may indirectly align with multiple objectives. Key information is missing about how project activities are aligned with achieving the objective(s).</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>The project does not directly or indirectly align with any Category Objectives.</p>

<b>Project Rationale</b>	<b>5 points</b> The applicant provides evidence that the project is needed. The project is likely to have a concrete and substantial positive impact on the lives of people in its target community and/or have a substantial positive impact on the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff. The impact per dollar of grant money used is very high.	<b>3-4 points</b> Some evidence is provided that the project is needed. The project is likely to provide a fairly concrete and moderate positive impact (direct or indirect) on the lives of people in its target community and/or provide a moderate positive impact on the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff. The impact per dollar of grant money is moderate.	<b>1-2 points</b> The project will likely provide a small, indirect, positive impact on the lives of people in its target community and/or provide a minor positive impact on the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff. There is insufficient evidence that the project is needed. The impact per dollar of grant money is low.	<b>0 points</b> No evidence is provided that the project is needed. The project is unlikely to have a positive impact on the lives of people in its target community or provide any benefit to the sustainability of the city of Flagstaff.
<b>Project Innovation</b>	<b>4 points</b> The project incorporates strategies or methods that are new (or new to their context). The project has substantial potential to teach new things about how to effectively approach sustainability-related problems. Creativity, experimentation, and/or breakthrough techniques are a feature of the project. Innovation is clearly described by the applicant.	<b>3 points</b> The project has the potential to refine or improve upon past strategies and methods in substantial ways. The project incorporates some innovative components that are well thought-out. Creativity and experimentation are smaller pieces of the project. Innovation is mostly clearly described by the applicant.	<b>1-2 points</b> New or improved strategies/methods are included, but they may not be a practical solution to the community's needs. Innovation is unclearly described by the applicant.	<b>0 points</b> The project does not include any new strategies or methods or does not have any potential to expand knowledge or teach new things about approaching sustainability-related problems.
<b>Project Longevity</b>	<b>4 points</b> The project will have direct and concrete effects for long after the term of the grant, potentially for years. The effects of the grant are unlikely to need further grant money to continue or the applicants have clearly stated how future funding will be secured. The impact will continue even if the person who applied for funding leaves the agency or can no longer work on the project.	<b>2-3 points</b> The project will have direct or indirect effects for long after the term of the grant, for at least one year. Future funding may be needed to continue the project, and the applicants have a plan in place.	<b>1 point</b> The project's long-term impacts are limited or will require future funding. There is no plan in place at this time for sustained impact beyond 6 months post-project completion.	<b>0 points</b> The project will not have any impact beyond the funding cycle; the benefits the project provides will end upon completion of the project itself. Or, applicants fail to discuss longevity in enough detail for the Sustainability Commission to conclude that there are benefits beyond the funding cycle.
<b>Alignment with Carbon Neutrality Plan</b>	<b>3 points</b> The project's activities align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan. This project will reduce emissions or is unlikely to create substantial greenhouse gas emission sources. Alternatively, or in addition, the project strengthens the community (resilience/adaptation) and/or prioritizes people most impacted by climate change (equity).	<b>2 points</b> This project's activities mostly align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan and/or do not contradict the CNP. When possible, this project uses materials and methods that minimize the amount of greenhouse gasses emitted over the course of its life cycle. Alternative materials or methods with a lower climate impact may exist, but these alternatives may be untenable within the budget and scope of the project, and the value of the project still greatly outweighs any emissions incurred. Alternatively, or in addition, this project somewhat strengthens the community and/or prioritizes people most impacted by climate change.	<b>1 point</b> This project uses tools, methods, or materials that do not align with the Carbon Neutrality Plan. Alternatives may exist but are not used. The positive impact of this project may not outweigh its climate impact.	<b>0 points</b> Important aspects of the project contradict Flagstaff's climate goals and applicants are unable to find an alternative.
Must score an average of 2 or higher to receive funding.				
<b>0-3 points</b>				