

Equity Framework Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Not Competitive (0)	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Outstanding (3)
Alignment with the Indianapolis Foundation’s Mission and Priorities	Applicant has no alignment with the IF mission and priorities. No focus on equity and/or closing/eliminating disparities. The work does not connect to any component of the IF strategies.	Applicant has limited alignment with the IF mission and priorities and has limited focus on equity or closing/eliminating, disparities. The work slightly connects to one of the IF strategies, but is not strongly aligned.	Applicant has significant alignment to the IF mission and priorities and has significant focus on equity and/or closing/eliminating disparities. The work utilizes one or more IF strategies and is mostly aligned.	Applicant is strongly aligned to the IF mission and priorities with a clear focus on equity and/or closing/eliminating disparities. The work utilizes one or more IF strategies and is in strong alignment.
Scope of Work: Direct Service - System Change	Applicant does not address solutions to close systemic gaps, dismantle inequitable systems, nor edistribute power.	Applicant's work is direct service but does not dismantle inequitable systems nor redistribute power.	Applicant's work is direct service, but is not done in a way that shifts power to communities directly impacted by systemic gaps.	Applicant's work effectively addresses systems change by dismantling inequitable systems and/or redistributing power.
Metrics & Measuring Performance	Applicant has proposed no clear method, whether quantitative or qualitative, nor technical infrastructure or expertise to measure progress toward its stated goals.	Applicant's proposed performance measures are insufficient or irrelevant for measuring progress toward their stated goals. Applicant is vague on their capacity to implement the proposed measures.	Applicant's proposed performance measures are clear and aligned with their stated goals, but some questions may remain on infrastructure or expertise needed to implement proposed measures.	Applicant's proposed performance measures are strong and clearly defined. Applicant has demonstrated that it has or can obtain the necessary resources, expertise, and/or infrastructure to implement these measures.
Authentic Stakeholder Engagement	Applicant has provided no evidence of stakeholder engagement; or the stated level of engagement is transactional and/or performative.	Applicant has provided minimal evidence of stakeholder engagement. Little to none of this engagement is targeted at individuals who have been historically marginalized.	Applicant has provided adequate evidence of stakeholder engagement, especially to historically marginalized persons, but organization could benefit from greater intentionality or using new approaches.	Applicant has provided strong evidence that it is responsive to historically marginalized persons, and is deeply and frequently engaged in the delivery of community-centered programs and services.

Equity Framework Scoring Rubric (continued)

Organizational Sustainability	Applicant is not financially stable with or only one funding source. Organization lacks the human and capital resources necessary to implement its proposed project.	Applicant has limited financial stability with two or less funding sources. Organization lacks most of the human and capital resources necessary to implement the project.	Applicant's finances are relatively stable, with several different funding sources and some cash reserves. Organization has most of the resources needed to implement proposed project.	Applicant is financially stable with diversified funding sources and ample cash reserves. Organization has sufficient resources to implement project effectively.
Demographics of Staff are Reflective of Community Served and IF Priority Populations	Less than 25 percent of the applicant's staff are reflective of community served and represent IF priority populations.	Between 25 and 50 percent of the applicant's staff are reflective of community served, represent IF priority neighborhoods, or IF priority populations.	Between 50 percent and 75 percent of the applicant's staff are reflective of community served and IF priority populations.	At least 75 percent or more of the applicant's staff are reflective of community served and IF priority populations.
Demographics of Board are Reflective of Community Served and IF Priority Populations	Less than 25 percent of the applicant's board of directors are reflective of community served and IF priority populations.	Between 25 and 50 percent of the applicant's board of directors are reflective of community served and IF priority populations.	Between 50 percent and 75 percent of the applicant's board of directors are reflective of community served and IF priority populations.	At least 75 percent or more of the applicant's board of directors are reflective of community served and IF priority populations.
Demographics of Population Served Align with IF Priority Populations	Less than 25 percent of the applicant's population served align with IF priority populations.	Between 25 and 50 percent of the applicant's population served align with IF priority populations.	Between 50 percent and 75 percent of the applicant's population served align with IF priority populations.	At least 75 percent or more of the applicant's population served align with IF priority populations.