

2025 Healthy Communities Delaware - Community Funding

Delaware Community Foundation

Evaluation

Project Name

Character Limit: 100

Place Based*

Proposed work targets an HCD-eligible community

Does the proposed work target an HCD-eligible community?

0-Proposed work does not target an HCD-eligible community

4-Proposed work targets an HCD-eligible community

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Vital Conditions*

The proposed work supports the conditions all people and places need to thrive.

How much does the proposed work focus on building vital conditions?

0 = Very Weak.

None/very little focus on addressing the vital conditions. Almost exclusively focused on addressing urgent needs (e.g. homelessness services, addiction services, food pantry, crime prevention).

1 = Weak.

Some focus on supporting the vital conditions, but mostly focus on addressing urgent needs.

2 = Adequate.

Moderate focus on vital conditions. About equal weight to addressing the vital conditions and urgent services.

3 = Strong.

Mostly focused on addressing vital conditions, but there is some focus on urgent services.

4 = Exceptional.

Complete or exclusive focus on addressing vital conditions.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Logic/Rationale*

A clear and logical connection among the identified needs, proposed activities, expected outputs, and desired outcomes.

How well does the project demonstrate a clear and logical connection among the identified needs, proposed activities, expected outputs, and desired outcomes?

0 = Very Weak.

No clear or logical connection between needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes.

1 = Weak.

Weak connection among needs activities, outputs, and outcomes with inconsistencies or gaps in the logic.

2 = Adequate.

Adequate connection among needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes with minor inconsistencies.

3 = Strong.

Strong connection among needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes with clear and logical flow.

4 = Exceptional.

Exceptional connection among needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, demonstrating a robust and well-reasoned project plan.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Evidence/Case for Success*

Best practices or evidence from research, pilot studies, or similar successful projects or well-reasoned, logical rationale

How compelling is the case presented to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s)?

0 = Very Weak.

No evidence or rationale provided to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). Any evidence/rationale provided is irrelevant, unreliable, or insufficient.

1 = Weak.

Limited evidence or rationale is provided to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). The evidence/rationale is weak, unconvincing, or not directly relevant to the proposed solution.

2 = Adequate.

Some relevant evidence or rationale is provided to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). The evidence/rationale may be adequate but could be strengthened.

3 = Strong.

Strong evidence from credible sources (research, pilot studies, successful projects) supports the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). The rationale is well-reasoned, persuasive, and logically sound.

4 = Exceptional.

Very strong evidence from rigorous research, multiple successful pilot studies, or similar large-scale successful projects supports the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). The rationale is highly convincing and supported by strong logic, compelling arguments, and a clear understanding of relevant factors.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Collaborative and Coordinated Community-Change*

Utilization of collaborative and coordinated community-change approaches

To what extent will the proposed work advance collaborative and coordinated community change (i.e., by focusing on building or maintaining place-based collaborative partnerships, assessing community needs, developing-community-driven plans, implementing community-driven plans, and/or monitoring or evaluating community-driven work)?

0 = Inadequate.

Little or no potential to advance collaborative and coordinated community change. Little or no evidence of activities that would build or strengthen community partnerships, address community needs, or support community-driven plans. It primarily serves organizational goals and mission, with minimal consideration for shared community goals or vision.

1 = Weak.

Limited potential to advance collaborative and coordinated community change. Some evidence of activities that may contribute to community vision/goals, but the focus is primarily on organizational mission and goals. The potential for building or strengthening community partnerships is minimal.

2 = Adequate.

Some potential to advance collaborative and coordinated community change. There is evidence of activities that may contribute to community collaboration. The work may contribute to

shared community goals/vision.

3 = Strong.

Strong potential to advance collaborative and coordinated community change. Includes activities that will significantly contribute to building or strengthening community partnerships, addressing community needs, and supporting community-driven initiatives. The work demonstrates a clear commitment to advancing shared community goals.

4 = Exceptional.

Exceptional potential to advance collaborative and coordinated community change. Includes activities that will significantly strengthen community partnerships, address critical community needs, and significantly advance community-driven initiatives. The work demonstrates a strong commitment to shared community goals and vision and has the potential to serve as a model for others.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Resident-Engagement*

Engagement and influence of residents

1. To what extent were residents engaged in developing this proposal?
2. To what extent will they be engaged in implementing the proposed work?
3. To what extent did residents contribute to identifying the need/opportunities addressed by this proposal and selecting the strategies included in the proposal?

0 = Very Weak.

Residents were not/will not be engaged in contributing to the proposal/proposed work.

1 = Weak.

Residents were/will be engaged in minimal ways during just one phase of the project. Resident involvement is one-off or infrequent.

2 = Adequate.

Residents were/will be consulted on some aspects of the project, but their involvement was limited. Resident involvement is moderate.

3 = Strong.

Residents were and will continue to be meaningfully involved in most phases of the proposal/proposed work, providing valuable feedback and contributing to the project's development and implementation. Resident involvement is frequent.

4 = Exceptional.

Residents were/will be engaged in all phases of the project, from identifying the need/opportunity to implementation. Their input will significantly shape the project's direction and outcomes. Resident involvement is continuous and ongoing.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Organizational Capacity*

Ability to implement its plan and achieve intended the results within the grant timeframe.

How adequate is the organization's capacity (staff, budget, capabilities, relationships, resources) for implementing its plan and achieving and measuring the intended results within the grant timeframe?

0 = Very Weak.

No capacity to effectively implement its plan and achieve the intended results within the grant timeframe.

1 = Weak.

Some capacity to implement its plan and achieve the intended results within the grant timeframe, but does not have a plan or resources to mobilize other resources.

2 = Adequate.

Some capacity to effectively implement its plan and achieve the intended results within the grant timeframe, but has a plan in place to mobilize other resources.

3 = Strong.

Strong capacity to effectively implement its plan and achieve the intended results within the grant timeframe.

4 = Exceptional.

More than sufficient capacity to implement its plan and achieve the intended results within the grant timeframe.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Track Record/Experience*

Experience and track record of success in similar projects.

How does the organization's experience and track record with similar projects demonstrate its ability to successfully implement the proposed work?

0 = Very Weak.

Very limited or no track record of success in similar projects.

1 = Weak.

Limited track record of success in similar projects.

2 = Adequate.

Reasonable track record of success in similar projects.

3 = Strong.

Strong track record of success in similar projects.

4 = Exceptional.

Excellent track record of success in similar projects.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Budget*

Expenses are reasonable, appropriate, and allowable.

1. How well does the proposed budget align with the proposed activities, intended outcomes, and overall project scope?
2. Are expenses reasonable, appropriate, and allowable?

0 = Inadequate.

The budget is significantly overestimated, underfunded, or does not align with the project's scope and objectives. Many expenses are unreasonable or not justifiable. The budget is unlikely to be approved.

1 = Weak.

The budget is incomplete, poorly justified, or the costs are excessive. Many expenses are unnecessary or poorly documented. The budget is unlikely to be approved without major revisions.

2 = Adequate.

The budget is adequate but could be improved. Some expenses may be questionable or require further justification. The budget may need revisions to be approved.

3 = Strong.

The budget is generally well-structured and justified. Most expenses are reasonable and necessary. Minor adjustments or clarifications may be needed for some expenses, but overall the budget is strong.

4 = Exceptional.

The budget is comprehensive, well-justified, and strongly aligns with the project's scope and objectives. All expenses are essential, reasonable, and well-documented. The budget is likely to be approved without major revisions.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 250

Do you recommend this proposal for HCD funding?*

Choices

Do not recommend

Recommend with modifications

Recommend as is

Notes

Character Limit: 250