|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PEOPLE** |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| 1. Organization or group’s mission and vision | History, mission, and vision are aligned with proposal.   Provides concrete examples of recent accomplishments that complement the work necessary to implement the proposal. | History, mission, and vision are aligned with proposal.   Example of accomplishments somewhat align with their proposal. It's uncertain whether the organization is the right fit to implement the proposal. | Not a strong fit to lead the proposed work. Their history, mission and vision are misaligned with proposal.   Example of accomplishments are unrelated to proposal or missing. |
| 2. Racial Justice is a lived value:   \*priority communities: BIPOC, immigrants and refugees, people with low incomes, youth, or elders | Racial justice is clearly a lived value within their group. They provide concrete examples about how they advance racial justice internally and/or externally. Some examples may include leadership development, workshops & trainings, organizing efforts with FEF priority communities, and more. | Applicant states racial justice is a lived value within their group without any concrete examples about how racial justice is advanced internally and/or externally. | It's unclear if racial justice is a lived value within their organization. Doesn't mention racial justice in relation to their work. They may focus exclusively on addressing other forms of oppression but does not mention how racial equity impacts their work, if at all. |
| 3. Community Involvement:   \*priority communities: BIPOC, immigrants and refugees, people with low incomes, youth, or elders | The community they are a part of is clearly defined with specific details on neighborhoods and/or demographics.   Priority communities are key decision makers and/or deeply involved at all phases of the proposed work.   Proposal is originated by, designed by, led by, and benefits FEF priority communities   If partners are included, they speak to either ongoing partners or new partnerships that demonstrate mutual partnership (Some examples: including partners in their budget, providing clear examples of reciprocity, and more) | The community they are a part of is somewhat defined.   Priority communities lead only some phases of the proposed work.   Priority communities helped design but do not lead the work or they did not originate the idea.   If partners are included, they speak to ongoing partners or new partnerships that align with the proposed work. | The community they are a part of is not clear or overly broad.   Priority communities are not key decision makers and/or are only engaged at the very end of the proposed work or not at all.   If partners are included, it’s unclear if partnerships are ongoing or if new partners have expressed interest to be part of the application. |
| **PROPOSAL** |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| 4. Proposal: | Project description is clear, specific and actionable.    The project is consistent with Food Equity Fund purpose to invest in community-led work that contributes to an equitable and sustainable local food system in Seattle.   The project aligns with the workplan and grant request budget. | Description is somewhat clear, or broad.   The project is consistent with Food Equity Fund purpose.   Project mostly aligns with states workplan and grant request budget. | Description is unclear and doesn’t align with stated workplan, budget, and/or Food Equity Fund purpose. |
| 5. Food Needs and Community-led solutions: | Food issues are specific and demonstrate a strong understanding of food inequities, needs, challenges, and/or priorities in their community or neighborhood.   Their solutions are culturally relevant and/or speak to existing community assets, culture, and traditions. | Food issues are general or demonstrate a surface level understanding of the food inequities and needs of the community or neighborhood.   Solutions are culturally relevant. | Food issues are not specific or overly broad. Issues don't relate to the unique inequities, needs, or challenges of their community or neighborhoods and speak about it in general terms.   Solutions aren't culturally relevant or don't speak to existing community assets, culture and traditions. |
| **IMPACT** | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| 6. How do you define success for your project and how will you know your efforts were successful? | The success is clearly tied to meaningful and specific community benefits for those who experience the most food and health disparities.   Success for the organization is defined with clear and actionable ways of measuring their achievements and or improvements. | Success is somewhat related to community benefits for those who experience the most food and health disparities.   Success is somewhat defined with a way to measure achievements and or improvements. | Success is tied to generalized community benefits and does not address inequitable impacts experienced by communities.   Success and measurements of achievement and or improvement are general. |
| 7. Advancing leadership in the local food system: | Applicant gives concrete examples on how BIPOC, people with low incomes, youth and/or elder leaders in the food system are intentionally developed or supported at multiple stages of the work. | Applicant shares they will advance BIPOC, people with low incomes, youth and/or elder leaders in the food system. Lacks concrete examples. | Applicant doesn't include how BIPOC, people with low incomes, youth and/or elder leaders are supported in the food system. |
| **ATTACHMENTS** | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Strong** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** |
| 8. Workplan Proposal | Key milestones and timeline are specific, realistic, and actionable. Milestones are related to one another and build on each other. | Key milestones and timeline are somewhat realistic but lack specificity or vice versa. | Key milestones and timeline are not realistic, overly broad, and not specific. |
| 9. Budget Proposal | Budget is detailed and feasible. Budget descriptions are specific and explain the allocation in detail. Budget request also strongly aligns with the stated workplan and narrative. | Budget is partially feasible and/or provides a general overview of allocations, without specific detail. Budget request aligns with the stated workplan and nrrative. | Budget is incomplete or isn’t feasible. It lacks alignment with stated workplan and narrative. |
| 10. Leadership Biographies | Majority or all team members working on the proposed work reflect the lived experiences of the communities they work with. | Team members working on the proposed work reflect the lived experiences of the communities they work with. | None or only one team member working on the proposed work reflect the lived experiences of the community they work with. Or its unclear how the team members relate to the community they work with. |