

Rubric for Application Review

Kingston Common Futures Pilot Cycle

About the Application Review

3-5 readers will review each application and score them according to the following rubric, which has two sections: Mission Alignment and Project Readiness.

A few notes about the rubric:

- The ways in which different projects will address the questions will be variable and nuanced.
- The rubric is designed to positively score projects, adding up to 5 points if a project is strongly in alignment with the assessment question.
- No negative points are given. If a project seems especially weak in a particular area, make a note.
- Strong projects will score in many, *but not all*, areas.
- If many projects score highly, review the notes and comments.
- The rubric scores projects as they are described in the application. No additional research (for example into community needs and gaps) should be done by the readers.

All readers go over one sample application together as part of their training to establish a shared baseline for scoring.

SECTION 1: Mission Alignment

This section of the rubric scores alignment to the mission of the fund, across four key areas:

1. *Place*
2. *Common good*
3. *Beneficiaries: benefiting and/or led by folks with less historic access to funds and leadership*
4. *Just Transition principles*

Question	Things to consider	Score	Notes/Comments
<u>Place:</u> To what extent is the project / are the applicant(s) connected to and rooted in Kingston?	Does this project already exist/have ties to community? Does leadership of this project have roots in this community? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well does this project fit into the county or region? 	1 = Not at all (<i>no connection to Kingston</i>) 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent (<i>deep connections to and roots in Kingston</i>)	
<u>Common Good:</u> To what extent does the project identify and propose to fill a need/gap in the Kingston community?		1 = Not at all (<i>project does not identify/propose to fill a need/gap</i>) 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent (<i>project identifies a need/gap and makes a very strong proposal for filling it</i>)	
<u>Common Good:</u> To what extent will this project benefit the community it is trying to serve?	The whole community a project is serving is variable: it could be a demographic, a city block, plants and animals sharing land with humans, the natural resources shared here. Does the project go broad or deep?	1 = Not at all (<i>project will benefit no one, or a very limited subset of the community it is trying to serve</i>) 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent (<i>project benefits the entire community it is trying to serve</i>)	
<u>Common Good:</u> To what extent will the project build relationships between community members?		1 = Not at all (<i>no relationships built</i>) 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent (<i>many diverse, deep webs of relationships built</i>)	
<u>Beneficiaries:</u> To what extent does this project support groups that have been	Will this project benefit a large number of people? Will this project benefit a smaller number of people more deeply?	1 = Not at all (<i>no historically marginalized groups supported</i>) 2 = To little extent	

under-resourced or denied structural access to resources or power? e.g. BIPOC folks, immigrant population, queer population, etc.		3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent <i>(historically marginalized groups are the primary beneficiaries)</i>	
<u>Beneficiaries:</u> To what extent does the applicant describe having limited access to funding?	Has the applicant/leadership of the project experienced limits in their access to power and capital historically?	1 = Not at all <i>(no limits on access to funding)</i> 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent <i>(highly limited access to funding)</i>	
<u>Just Transition Principles:</u> To what extent does this project relocalize economic power?		1 = Not at all 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent	
<u>Just Transition Principles:</u> To what extent does this project drive racial justice and social equity?		1 = Not at all 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent	
<u>Just Transition Principles:</u> To what extent does this project democratize communities, wealth and work?		1 = Not at all 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent	
<u>Just Transition Principles:</u> T To what extent does this project advance ecological repair?		1 = Not at all 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent	
<u>Just Transition Principles:</u> To what extent does this project retain and/or restore cultural diversity?		1 = Not at all 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent	
Sub-total score			

SECTION 2: Project Readiness

This section of the rubric scores project readiness by looking at the comprehensiveness of the project budget, plan, and timeline, and overall readiness of the project and its applicant.

Question	Things to consider	Score	Notes/Comments
To what extent is the budget presented clear and comprehensive?	Are there things that clearly need funding that are not depicted in the project budget?	1 = Not at all <i>(budget is missing or incomplete)</i> 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent <i>(budget is clear, detailed, and comprehensively covers project costs)</i>	
To what extent are the project plan and timeline supported and clear?	Does the applicant have a clear and executable plan and timeline?	1 = Not at all <i>(plan and timeline are missing or incomplete)</i> 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent <i>(plan and timeline are clear, well-supported, comprehensively covering project activities)</i>	
To what extent will the project's budget keep funds circulating in the local economy?	Will supplies be sourced from local businesses? Will stipends be paid to individuals who live locally? Will funds go into the hands of folks this project, and the community fund, aims to directly benefit?	1 = Not at all <i>(there is no evidence that money will stay local)</i> 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent <i>(the majority of funding is designed to stay local according to the proposal/budget)</i>	

To what extent does the applicant have the experience and pre-existing relationships necessary to execute their project?		1 = Not at all (<i>applicant has no prior experience or relationships that facilitate project execution</i>) 2 = To little extent 3 = To some extent 4 = To a large extent 5 = To a very large extent (<i>applicant has deep prior experience and relationships that facilitate project execution</i>)	
Sub-total score			

Rubric	Sub-total score
Rubric 1: Mission Alignment	
Rubric 2: Project Readiness	
TOTAL APPLICATION SCORE	