

2026 Equitable Development Initiative RFP Evaluation & Scoring Rubric

Each question will be scored on a scale from 1 (low score) to 5 (high score). Review will take scoring into consideration alongside board and program priorities of geographic distribution, type of project, and communities served.

Site Control & Due Diligence (Capital Applicants only)

STRONG (deserves high score)	AVERAGE	AREA FOR GROWTH (deserves low score)
The project demonstrates a preparedness to complete the proposed project phase by a combination of several due diligence items being completed and a fleshed-out project team	The project has completed some due diligence items and has a couple of professional project team members	Little to no due diligence items are completed and there are no indicated professional services on the project team
The proposal clearly lists potential risks to the specific project with direct strategies to ensure the project will move forward	The proposal identifies some broad risks to their project and identifies some plan to address them	The proposal does not identify any potential project risks, OR The proposal vaguely describes some capital project risks without addressing how to solve them
The proposal clearly states that EDI funding will be the last funding necessary to complete the identified project phase, as supported by the Sources and Uses sheet	The Source and Uses budget indicates some requested but unconfirmed funds from other sources, and the proposal describes some ability to move the project into the next phase	The Sources and Uses are incomplete or primarily uncommitted sources, with a large funding gap not being addressed

Project Scope & Capacity

STRONG (deserves high score)	AVERAGE	AREA FOR GROWTH (deserves low score)
-------------------------------------	----------------	---

The organization has a clear plan and milestones for delivering the proposal through a defined use of capacity building funds	The organization describes some general ideas and a few broad milestones for using capacity building funds to support the project	The proposal lacks any concrete plans or milestones for utilizing capacity building funds to support the broader project
The provided budget is comprehensive and inclusive of full project scope costs, with sources (committed and proposed) indicated	The proposed budget demonstrates some consideration of cost while lacking in some detail for the proposed scope of work	The provided budget fails to align with the scope of work as described or is incomplete
The proposed scope of work checklist clearly aligns with the submitted budget and project milestones	The proposed scope of work has some items that are loosely represented in the budget or milestone	The proposed scope of work does not align with the proposed budget, and the milestones do not match the scope activities

Displacement Risk & Access to Opportunity

STRONG (deserves high score)	AVERAGE	Area for Growth (deserves low score)
The applicant demonstrates how the programs and services will mitigate displacement risks or opportunity gaps	The applicant lists some general services but does not make a strong connection to any anti-displacement strategies	The applicant lists little to no intended services and programs and/or does not show any anti-displacement outcomes

Equity Drivers

STRONG (deserves high score)	AVERAGE	Area for Growth (deserves low score)
-------------------------------------	----------------	---

<p>The proposal thoroughly and effectively describes measurable outcomes that advance 3+ specific EDI equity drivers</p>	<p>The proposal describes some measurable outcomes without adequately describing how it aims to advance EDI Equity drivers</p>	<p>The proposal lacks a vision or fails to describe how it will advance EDI Equity drivers</p>
--	--	--

Depth of Relationship to Community

<p>STRONG (deserves high score)</p>	<p>AVERAGE</p>	<p>Area for Growth (deserves low score)</p>
<p>The proposal directly states a detailed history of engaging with the community to create the project, and the proposal clearly outlines why community is prioritizing this project</p>	<p>The proposal mentions some engagement with community without a clear reason for the community buy-in</p>	<p>The proposal does not describe any previous community engagement, and it is not clear how or why this project is a priority</p>
<p>The proposal contains a clear description of how the project will be accountable to community members</p>	<p>The proposal minimally describes how the project will be accountable and a sufficient feedback structure</p>	<p>There is no formal structure for feedback or accountability within the proposal</p>