VECF Innovation Grant Scoring Rubric

1	**Clear and Realistic** Is the project plan clear, realistic, and within the organization's capacity to fulfill?	- Not at all - There is no evidence that the plan is clear, realistic, or that the organization has capacity to complete the work - Mediocre - The plan is clear but lacks detail or is unrealistic, and/or there are concerns about ability to complete work. - Good - Project plan is clear and realistic, capacity may be stretched but concerns are minimal. - Exceptional - Project plan is well thought-out, clear, and realistic; organization is well positioned to complete work, no concerns.
2	**Goal Alignment** Does the application narrative clearly support the primary goal selected by the applicant? - Equitable Access - Improved Quality - Workforce Development - Family Engagement and Leadership, and Connecting Families to Services - Other	- Not at all - There is no evidence of how this project will address the selected VECF goal - Mediocre - The narrative mentions the goal, but the connection between the goal and the project is unclear - Good - The narrative discusses the goal and logically explains how the project accomplishes the goal - Exceptional - The project clearly accomplishes the goal and discusses immediate & long-term impact the project would have on the goal
3	**Additional Goals** Does the application narrative clearly support additional goals selected by the applicant?	- Yes - No

4	**Fairness and Equity** Does this project address fairness and equity issues in the proposal?Does this project include strategies that address equity and include VECF's target population of vulnerable children and families? Based on the PDG B-5 Planning Grant, Vermont's 2020 EC Needs Assessment defined the target population of vulnerable children as children, from birth through third grade who: **1.** Are in low-income families; **2.** Have developmental disabilities or delays; **3.** Are English language learners; **4.** Are refugees; **5.** Are migrant and/or undocumented; **6.** Are experiencing homelessness; **7.** Are geographically isolated (critical given the rural nature of Vermont); **8.** Have parents who are incarcerated; **9.** Are at risk of, or have experienced, abuse or neglect or trauma including children in foster care *Any of these children would be considered underserved when economic or environmental challenges, or lack of family or public resources limit access to services and supports that are developmentally beneficial for the child and strengthen their family. Since the needs assessment, this definition of vulnerable children has been expanded to include:* **10.** Infants and toddlers **11.** Children and families in need of mental health and emotional supports.	● Not at all - There is no evidence of how this project addresses fairness and equity and the application does not mention target populations of vulnerable children. ● Mediocre - The project mentions one of the target populations but does not provide much detail or alignment in the project strategy. Fairness and equity are an after-thought. ● Good - The project demonstrates a commitment to one or more target populations in activities, budget, or strategies and it is realistic for the project. ● Exceptional - The project prioritizes one or more target populations of vulnerable children, demonstrates a commitment and understanding of systemic inequities, and has strategies to address them.
5	**Address Barrier or Problem** Is this project addressing a persistent barrier or problem that has effects throughout Vermont's early childhood system?	● Not at all - Project narrative is incomplete or unclear about what barrier or problem it is addressing ● Mediocre - Project narrative addresses problem it seeks to solve, but problem and/or solution is small in scale or isolated in scope

			● Good - Project addresses problem it seeks to solve, provides evidence the problem has been persistent OR affects several regions ● Exceptional - Project addresses problem, provides evidence the problem has been persistent over time AND is a state-wide issue
6	**Potential** Does this project have the potential to make change at the systems level?		● Not at all - Project narrative does not provide evidence of addressing change at the systems level ● Mediocre - Project narrative mentions addressing change at systems level, but connections are unclear or minimal ● Good - Discusses systems-level change in some detail, and is based on an initial pilot OR evidence-based best practice ● Exceptional - Systems-level change, based on pilot OR evidence-based best practice, has strong stakeholder input and buy-in, and potential to expand or replicate
7	**Budget** Is the budget realistic for meeting the primary goal of the project? Does it provide enough detail and align with the project activities and goals?		● Yes ● No
8	**Overall** Overall, would you recommend this project receive funding?		● Not at all - Narrative did not provide enough information AND/OR too many concerns to recommend it be funded ● Mediocre recommendation - Project narrative lacked detail AND/OR had major concerns that would need to be addressed ● Good recommendation - Clear project, adequate detail, some minor concerns but org can complete & addresses a worthwhile goal ● Exceptional rec. - Clear project, strong capacity, equity-centered approach, VECF priority, addresses system-wide problem