**Taking Care of Main Street Operational Grant RUBRIC**

Our TCOMS review committee uses the following scoring rubric to evaluate applications. Please note that each point within a category is not a comprehensive checklist. Rather, the information below is intended to provide scoring guidance.

**Applicant Name:**       **Date:**

**Threshold Items:** (application is automatically ineligible without meeting these requirements)

* Applicant is an IAMS or NAMS organization in good-standing with Indiana Main Street.
* Applicant submitted the application through SurveyMonkey by the published deadline.
* Match is 50% of total eligible project costs.
* Proof is provided of available local match. Proof is either a bank statement (without your bank account number) or written documentation on bank letterhead that the organization has the match funds available.
* Organization has included a W9 and direct deposit form.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Unacceptable** | **Good** | **Exemplary** | **Points Awarded** | **Notes** | |
| **Organizational Excellence**  *30 Points* | -Board minutes were not included or contained minimal information. If minutes were submitted, the organization has not held a meeting within the past 2 months.  -The organization did not include a board member resolution or it is not signed by any board members.  -Recent board minutes do not include any discussion on TCOMS grant.  -The Main Street America Self-Assessment results and funding request do not or only minimally correlate.  -Documents and/or information was missing or incomplete.  *0-10 points* | -The most recent board meetings minutes did not have at least 75% of the board in attendance.  -The board member resolution does not include signatures from 100% of board members.  -The board minutes indicated that the TCOMS grant was discussed but they do not show that a vote was taken supporting the grant application.  -The Main Street America Self-Assessment results somewhat correlate to the funding request.  *11-20 points* | -Most recent board meetings minutes indicate that at least 75% of the board was in attendance and the meeting was led by the board president or vice president.  -The board member resolution includes signatures from 100% of board members.  -The board minutes indicate that the TCOMS grant was voted on and approved.  -The Main Street America Self-Assessment results correlate to the funding request, and the organization makes a strong case as to why the funding is being requested.  *21-30 points* | out of 30 |  | |
| **Work Plan Quality**  *30 points* | -The 2023 work plan does not include measurable goals, volunteer/staffing responsibilities, budget, and tasks in the 4-points.  -The organization has not set goals to expand capacity in 2023.  -The organization cannot demonstrate that it took steps to expand capacity for the program in 2022.  *0–10 points* | -The 2023 work plan includes more than a list of tasks, but may be missing some required items such as measurable goals, volunteer/staffing responsibilities, budget, and tasks in the 4-points.  -The organization has goals to expand capacity in 2023 but these goals are not tied to their application request and/or the Main Street America Self-Assessment results.  -The organization took some steps in 2022 to expand capacity for the program, but limited information is provided.  *11-20 points* | -The 2023 work plan is complete and has measurable goals, volunteer/staffing responsibilities, budget, and tasks in all 4-points.  -The organization has set goals with measurable outcomes on how to expand capacity in 2023 and has already begun taking steps to reach those goals. These goals are clearly tied to their application request and/or the Main Street America Self-Assessment results.  -The organization can demonstrate that it took steps to expand capacity for the program in 2022.  *21-30 points* | out of 30 |  | |
| **Measurable outcomes and goals**  *20 Points* | -The applicant has not provided sufficient detail to clearly explain how the grant funding will be used.  -A project budget was not included or is missing line-item details. Applicant does not provide quotes or other information on how they arrived at the proposed project budget. There is no information provided to show how the proposed project will be supported in the future.  -Less than three measurable goals were identified.  -The applicant does not make a case for the financial need for the project. If supporting documentation is included, it is not easy for the review committee to interpret or tie to the financial need for the project.  *-0–10 points* | -The applicant has explained how the grant funding will be used but some questions remain.  -A project budget is included but some details are missing. Applicant does not provide quotes or only provided limited information on how they arrived at the proposed project budget. Limited information is provided that explains how the proposed project will be supported in the future.  -Three measurable goals have been identified but baseline metrics are missing.  -Supporting documentation does not support financial need for the project.  *11–15 points* | -The applicant has explained in detail how the grant funding will be used.  -A detailed project budget has been included. Applicant has provided quotes or detailed information on how they arrived at the proposed project budget. Detailed information is provided that explains how the proposed project will be supported in the future.  -The applicant has developed three measurable goals for the project funding with baseline metrics.  -Financial need for the project is clear and is supported through additional documentation.  *16-20 points* | out of 20 |  | |
| **Community Engagement**  *10 Points* | -The organization has no plans to communicate the TCOMS funding to the community and/or partners.  -The organization did not submit a letter of support from the local unit of government.  *0–3 points* | -The organization has plans to communicate the TCOMS funding to the community and/or partners, but details are missing or incomplete.    -Letter from the Chief Elected Official of the community expresses support for the project.  *4–6 points* | -The organization has a plan to communicate that they received TCOMS funding to the community and/or partners, and they provide detail as to how they will carry out that plan.  -Letter from the Chief Elected Official of the community expresses support for the project and the growth of the organization. The letter also demonstrates how the local government plans to support the organization throughout 2023 and 2024.  *7-10 points* | out of 10 |  | |
| **Discretionary**  *10 Points* | -The application was not entirely completed.  -The organization has outstanding reporting and/or agreements due  *0 points* | -The applicant filled out all required sections of the grant application.  -The organization had late annual reporting and/or agreements in 2022, OR annual reporting was submitted on time but was not complete.  *5 points* | -The applicant has gone above the application requirements to communicate the need for the grant.  -The organization turned in complete 2022 annual reporting and level & logo agreements on time.  *10 points* | out of 10 |  | |
| **Add together the points you assigned for each of the core components and factors listed above and enter the total to the right.**  **This is your final score.** | | | | | | **out of 100 potential points** | |