**City of St. Petersburg**

**My Brothers and Sisters Keeper**

**Scoring Rubric • 2021-2022 • Youth Development Grant**

**How to use this rubric**

Grant panelists will receive a copy of the rubric as a part of their review materials. The rubric will be employed to ensure as fair and unbiased a panel process as possible. The scoring mechanism defines each of the four criteria scored by panelists: Community Impact, Youth Focus, Project Quality, and Originality. Within each criterion, benchmark descriptions and corresponding point values are listed to serve as a guide in the scoring process.

**Overall consideration for the applications**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Value** | **Description** | **Score** |
| **Excellent** | Strongly demonstrates public value of serving at-risk youth in St. Petersburg. Merits investment of City of St. Petersburg funding.  | **92 - 100**  |
| **Good** | Satisfactorily demonstrates public value of serving at-risk youth in our community. Merits investment of City of St. Petersburg funding.  | **80 - 91** |
| **Fair** | Does not sufficiently demonstrate public value of serving at-risk youth in our community. Does not merit investment of City of St. Petersburg funding.  | **61 -79** |
| **Weak** | Makes an incomplete and/or inadequate case for the public value of serving at-risk youth in our community. Does not merit investment of City of St. Petersburg funding. Information is confusing, unclear, and lacks specific details. | **0 - 60** |

**Community Impact (Up to 35 Points)**

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Community Impact: the responses to the questions for project/program description; description of the impact; and the public benefit. Panelists should consider whether the project/program will affect change for as many youth as possible.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent****27-35 points** | **Good****26-30 points** | **Fair****21-25 points** | **Weak****0-20 points** |
| Project description clearly describes impact of the program and activities fully support the public benefit. | Project description describes impact of the program and activities fully support the public benefit. | Project description describes impact of the program and activities do not fully support the public benefit. | Project description does not clearly describe impact of the program and activities do not fully support the public benefit. |
| Identifies clear goals and fully measurable objectives and activities.  | Identifies clear goals and measurable objectives and activities.  | Identifies goals and limited measurable objectives and activities.  | Does not identify goals and very minimal objectives and activities.  |
| Confident in the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. | Very minimal concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. | Concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. | Multiple concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. |
| Very appropriate number of individuals benefiting from the program/project. | Appropriate number of individuals benefiting from the program/project. | Minimal number of individuals benefiting from the program/project. | Very minimal number of individuals benefiting from the program/project. |
|  |

**Youth Focus (Up to 35 Points)**

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Youth Focus: whether the project/program addresses a concern for at-risk youth; whether the project/program identifies specific benefits of significance to the well-being of at-risk youth; whether the project/program goal is to enhance outcomes related to the education, workforce participation, or enrichment of youth in the city of St. Petersburg; and the strength of the marketing/promotion/publicity plans and youth recruitment strategy.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent27-35 points** | **Good26-30 points** | **Fair21-25 points** | **Weak0-20 points** |
| Provides vital services to at-risk youth population. | Provides significant services to at-risk youth population. | Provides services to at-risk youth population. | Provides minimal services to at-risk youth population. |
| Provides compelling and specific information about how the program/project will enhance the education, economic circumstance, or enrichment of at-risk youth in St. Petersburg. | Provides significant information about how the program/project will enhance the education, economic circumstance, or enrichment of at-risk youth in St. Petersburg.  | Provides limited information about how the project/program will enhance the education, economic circumstance, or enrichment of at-risk youth in St. Petersburg.  | Provides very minimal information about how the project/program will enhance the education, economic circumstance, or enrichment of at-risk youth in St. Petersburg. |
| Educational and outreach components fully serve the youth and are appropriate for the project/program. | Educational and outreach components serve the youth and are appropriate for the project/program. | Limited educational and outreach components serve the youth and are minimally appropriate for the project/program. | Very minimal educational and outreach components that do not serve the youth and are not appropriate for the project/program. |
| Very appropriate and effective marketing/promotion/publicity and youth recruitment efforts  | Appropriate and effective marketing/promotion/publicity and youth recruitment efforts.  | Limited and minimally effective appropriate marketing/promotion/publicity and youth recruitment efforts.  | Very limited and minimally effective marketing/promotion/publicity and youth recruitment efforts. |

**Project Quality (Up to 25 points)**

Panelists will consider the following application information when evaluating an application for Project Quality: the number of proposed events, opportunities for public participation; the location of the project/program; and the estimated number of youths benefiting. Panelists must evaluate the whether the project is well planned, adequately budgeted and is ready for implementation or is a part of a broader ongoing effort, and whether the project includes a well-defined method for demonstrating that the funds are expended appropriately.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent21-25 points** | **Good16-20 points** | **Fair11-15 points** | **Weak****0-10 points** |
| Very confident in the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information. | Very minimal concerns about the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information. | Concerns about the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information. | Multiple concerns about the organization's fiscal stability and ability to carry out the proposed activities given the operating budget, grant proposal budget, and fiscal information. |
| Goals of the project/program are well-defined, clear, and help the organization achieve its mission and vision. | Goals of the project/program help the organization achieve its mission and vision.  | Goals of the project/program only minimally help the organization achieve its mission and vision. | Goals of the program are not clear and do not help the organization achieve its mission and vision. |
| Extensive activities are proposed and are achievable within the grant period. | Reasonable activities are proposed, and these activities are achievable within the grant period. | Limited activities are proposed and/or concerns about the achievability of the activities within the grant period. | Very minimal activities are proposed and/or serious concerns about the achievability of the proposed activities during the grant period. |
| Confident in the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. | Very minimal concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. | Concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. | Multiple concerns about the ability of the organization to carry out the proposal. |
| Project outlines plan for sustaining efforts beyond grant lifecycle |  |  |  |
| Project clearly defines desired outcomes. |  |  |  |

**Originality (Up to 5 points)**

Panelists will award points based on a demonstration that the proposed project/program innovatively and creatively addresses a problem that is significantly under-resourced within the community that serves the youth population. Creative thinking is welcome and encouraged.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Excellent5 points** | **Good4 points** | **Fair3 points** | **Weak0 - 2 points** |
| Project/program clearly describes a problem it wishes to address.  | Project/program describes a problem it wishes to address.  | Project/program vaguely describes a problem it wishes to address.  | Project/program does not describe a problem it wishes to address. |
| Project/program is extremely creative and innovative in way it addresses the problem described. | Project/program is creative and innovative in way in addressing the problem described. | Project/program is somewhat creative and innovative in addressing the problem described. | Project/program is not creative and innovative in addressing the problem described. |
|  |