

CORE Collaborative Application Rubric

Demonstrated Partnership with Families: Does this collaborative see families as a partner?

Where to find: Question 12, logic model and elsewhere.

Excellent looks like (3):	Collaborative has engaged families in planning and will continue to engage them in the future of this collaborative. Family engagement is embedded into collaborative's plan elsewhere in the proposal. Families have a role in the success of this collaborative.
Good looks like (2):	Collaborative has incorporated families into planning process already, and have plans for engaging families throughout the life of this grant. Family engagement is embedded into collaborative's plan elsewhere in the proposal.
Adequate looks like (1):	Collaborative has incorporated families into planning process already, and have plans for engaging families throughout the life of this grant.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Families are able to provide feedback only or there is no engagement of families served.
Score	Rationale for Score

Logic Model Questions: Does this collaborative have a logical plan to achieve 2-generation outcomes?

Where to find: Questions 13-18.

Excellent looks like (3):	Responses present detailed plan, demonstrating how the resources and activities contributed by partners or funded through this grant will lead to the identified 2-generation outcomes and eventually the long-term goals. Overall, the plan makes logical sense; no major elements missing. Problem statement and goals show understanding of long-term need of the community served, and the potential for long-term impact.
Good looks like (2):	Responses present a plan (with few concerns), demonstrating how the resources and activities contributed by partners or funded through this grant will lead to the identified 2-generation outcomes and eventually the long-term goals. Overall, the plan makes logical sense; no major elements missing.
Adequate looks like (1):	Responses present a plan (with several concerns), demonstrating how the resources and activities contributed by partners or funded through this grant will lead to the identified 2-generation outcomes and eventually the long-term goals.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Plan doesn't include all partners OR plan doesn't make logical sense OR plan only addresses one generation (adults or children).
Score	Rationale for Score

Target Demographics: Does this collaborative serve those in our priority populations?

Where to find: Target demographics (19 & 20) questions.

Excellent looks like (3):	Plan to focus on equitably serving underrepresented groups in Snohomish County, collection of demographic information, specific focus on one or more priority populations (185% FPL and below, female heads of household, people of color, people of Hispanic/Latino origin, people with disabilities). Applicant provides example that shows data is likely to be used in decision-making around equitably serving the community.
Good looks like (2):	Plan to focus on equitably serving underrepresented groups in Snohomish County, collection of demographic information, specific focus on one or more priority populations (185% FPL and below, female heads of household, people of color, people of Hispanic/Latino origin, people with disabilities).
Adequate looks like (1):	Plan to focus on equitably serving underrepresented groups in Snohomish County, collection of demographic information, serves at least one priority population.

Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Little or no plan to equitably serve underrepresented groups in Snohomish County, little or no collection of demographic information, OR does not serve at least one priority population.
Score	Rationale for Score
Collaborative Work 1 (Basic Needs): Does this collaborative ensure basic needs of the family are met?	
Where to find: Question 23, logic model.	
Excellent looks like (3):	It is embedded into collaborative's plan to assess and ensure basic needs of families will be consistently met. This is supported in the plan laid out by the logic model.
Good looks like (2)	Basic needs of families will be assessed and and there is a plan for ensuring basic needs are met.
Adequate looks like (1):	Basic needs of families will be referred elsewhere to be assessed and to ensure basic needs are met.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Little or no plan for ensuring basic needs are met.
Score	Rationale for Score
Collaborative Work 2 (Innovation): Would this collaborative demonstrate what is possible because of this new way to do work?	
Where to find: Questions 24-26, and logic model	
Excellent looks like (3):	Collaborative describes innovation in service delivery by describing how working collaboratively will change how the partners do their work and how families access services. Collaborative has eye on innovative changes for larger system serving low-income children and families (examples: advocacy opportunities, broader partnership). Answer is supported by plans laid out in logic model.
Good looks like (2)	Collaborative describes innovation in service delivery by describing how working collaboratively will change how the partners do their work and how families access services. Answer is supported by plans laid out in logic model.
Adequate looks like (1):	Collaborative describes innovation in service delivery.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Collaborative describes nothing different from current service delivery model from each partner.
Score	Rationale for Score
Collaborative Work 3 (Working Collectively): Will partners work together well?	
Where to find: Question 27 and letters of support.	
Excellent looks like (3):	Applicant describes realistic expectations and potential plan for how partners could hold each other accountable, and how challenges may be approached. Partners all articulate and demonstrate commitment to a shared vision. Partner letters of support show an understanding of the shared work beyond being a referral partner.

Good looks like (2):	Applicant describes how partners could hold each other accountable, and how challenges may be approached. Partners all articulate and demonstrate commitment to a shared vision. Partner letters of support show an understanding of the shared work beyond being a referral partner.
Adequate looks like (1):	Applicant describes how partners could hold each other accountable, and how challenges may be approached. Most partners articulate and demonstrate commitment to a shared vision.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Goals and vision are not shared or show coordination of different agency priorities rather than a shared path forward for serving families. No ideas presented for accountability or addressing challenges.
Score	Rationale for Score

--	--

Collaborative Work 4 (Leadership Capacity): Do partners have the leadership capacity necessary for success?

Where to find: Letters of support.

Excellent looks like (3):	Multiple partners describe experience coordinating work with other programs/agencies beyond referrals, and convincing evidence of strong staff (including agency executive) and board leadership's commitment to working collaboratively.
Good looks like (2)	Multiple partners describe experience partnering with others, and convincing evidence of agency leadership's (including agency executive) commitment to working collaboratively.
Adequate looks like (1):	Multiple partners describe experience partnering with others, and agency leadership's commitment to working collaboratively.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Few or no partners have experience partnering with others, and this proposal to work collaboratively to solve community problems lacks support from agency's leadership.
Score	Rationale for Score

--	--

Note: the following two sections are weighted differently from those above.

Collaborative Work 5 (UWSC's role): Does this collaborative identify a role for United Way staff and volunteers?

Where to find: Question 27.

Adequate looks like (1):	Collaborative describes how United Way staff and volunteers can contribute beyond a funding relationship to the success of this collaborative and families' achievement of the outcomes.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	There is no role for United Way staff or volunteers beyond funding.
Score	Rationale for Score

--	--

Budget: Would this be a good investment of funds?

Where to find: Budget, logic model and elsewhere.

Adequate looks like (1):	Collaborative has budget proposal showing expenses related to their outcomes.
Unsatisfactory looks like (0):	Collaborative doesn't provide budget proposal or doesn't show any expenses related to their outcomes.
Score (Only 0 or 1 possible)	Rationale for Score

9 parts = 23 points possible	Total Points: