

FY2026-27 Local Service Committee Grant Application Evaluation Criteria

This document guides the Seattle Rotary Service Foundation (SRSF) in scoring Grant proposals. The SRSF President or the Grants Committee Chair assigns Trustees and other volunteers to Teams responsible for the grants submitted by one or more service committees. Each Trustee reads and rates the proposals using the criteria below and records results on the scoring form provided. Each Review Team then meets to compare scores and reach a consensus regarding how each proposal should be scored. The Review Team Captain sends their scores to the Grants Committee Chair, who convenes the Grant Committee to compare the scores of all the grants and propose funding recommendations to the SRSF board. While this is not a totally objective process, SRSF endeavors to score each proposal appropriately and fairly. Each proposal is evaluated by the criteria below using a 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) score per criterion. Half points may be awarded (e.g., "3.5"). Then, each criterion score is multiplied by a weighting factor reflecting the relative importance of that criterion (see the score sheet for the weights applied).

1. **Alignment with Mission & Goals: (weight 2.0)** How well does the project meet Rotary's Mission and Goals? Each year, the SRSF board selects priorities for our grants based on surveys from club members. This year's grant cycle priorities for **local** projects are:
 - a. Supports the health, recovery, and sustainability of downtown Seattle, which includes several interrelated issues such as homelessness, addressing drug addiction and mental health, and public safety
 - b. Supports education and literacy
 - c. Supports food insecurity
2. **Organizational Capacity: (weight 2.0)** The proposing organization has a clear mission and strategy, strong leadership, experience delivering similar projects, and a sound financial management track record.
3. **Project Soundness & Methodology: (weight 1.5)** The proposal demonstrates a clear and well-defined problem statement and a sound methodology to address it.
 - a. The problem statement and its context are clear and well-defined
 - b. The project meets a priority need of the beneficiaries
 - c. There is a clear plan and strategy to address the problem with well-defined SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound)
 - d. Partnerships, if any, are identified, and their roles are clearly defined
4. **Project Impact and Outcomes: (weight 2.0)** What is the expected impact and outcome of the project?
 - a. The project is maximized for value: in addition to clearly articulated initial outcomes, how might this project have a lasting impact on beneficiaries beyond the grant period?
 - b. The SRSF grant plays a catalytic and recognized role
 - c. The number of beneficiaries is identified
 - d. There is a clear plan for communicating the project's impact to the Rotary community.
5. **Opportunities for Seattle 4 Rotarians to be involved in implementation: (weight 0.5)** Does the project have opportunities for Seattle 4 Rotarians to be involved in the grant project?