2021 The Displaced Tenants Fund for Housing Justice & Affordability Grant: Scoring Rubric

Decision Process & Timeline

Proposals received by the deadline will be considered by a community grantmaking committee. The committee will use a social justice values driven grantmaking process modeled after Social Justice Fund's Giving Project programs. Finalists will be invited to conduct an in-person site visit with members of the grantmaking committee (in October - November) and may be asked to submit additional information and supplemental materials at that time. Grant awards will be announced in December. Grant funds will be disbursed in January 2022. Annual year-end reports will be required plus additional light monitoring of project phases and status if determined necessary. All monitoring requirements will be described in detail in the grant agreement.

Scoring & Evaluation System

Applicant scores can range from 0 - 100 total points, with potential for additional points for each extra credit priority.

Application materials will be evaluated based on the following scoring rubric. Scores are not the sole determinant of whether an applicant will receive a grant but play a big role in identifying consensus and priorities within the grantmaking committee.

ASPECT OF APPLICATION	SCORE	HIGH SCORE	LOW SCORE
PROJECT IMPACT & RESULTS	(0-5) x 7	Ø Proposal shows a clear connection between the project and the fund's values Ø Proposal describes realistic and measurable outcomes that advance at least three of the six key result areas Ø Proposal describes how the project will provide long term benefits to the community Ø Project can serve as an innovative model in regard to community ownership, affordability, and/or accessibility	Ø Proposal has a limited logical connection to the fund's values Ø Project is really only committed to one key result area and other result areas are tacked on in an effort to fit the application Ø The community benefit is short term Ø Project lacks innovation
EQUITY	(0-5) x 5	Ø Applicant demonstrates leadership by - and accountability to - communities most impacted by displacement, specifically communities of color, immigrant & refugee communities, poor communities, people with disabilities, LGBTQ communities, houseless communities, and those who are formerly incarcerated Ø Project demonstrates effort to maximize the creation of affordable low barrier housing for households making 0-45% AMI	Ø Applicant is not led by or accountable to communities most impacted by displacement Ø Proposal describes a minimal effort to create affordable low barrier housing for households making 0-45% AMI

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT	(0-5) x 4	Ø Applicant is an organization led by the community the project will serve Ø Applicant has experience facilitating effective community engagement processes or is partnering with a community based organization who does Ø Proposal demonstrates a clear strategy for community engagement at all levels of the process and accountability to the community in which the project will be built/housed Ø Project plan is clearly tied to addressing needs and benefits identified by the community it is trying to serve	Ø Applicant organization is not led by the community the project will serve Ø Applicant lacks experience facilitating community engagement processes and is not working with a community based partner who does Ø Proposal lacks a clear plan for how to engage community in all levels of the process, does not display accountability to the community in which the project will be built/housed Ø Project plan is disconnected from or lacks knowledge of the needs and benefits desired by the community it is trying to serve
DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE (note: partnership is not a requirement but will be evaluated in terms of development experience)	(0-5) x 2	Ø Applicant has successfully led a development project before Ø Applicant may lack development experience but is strategically utilizing relationships with experienced partners, staff, or technical assistants Ø Applicant may lack development experience but the proposed project has been in development for some time and the work already completed on the project demonstrates preparation and readiness Ø Project timeline reflects realistic and achievable benchmarks	Ø Applicant lacks development experience and proposed project is in nascent conceptual phase Ø Applicant does not have relationships with more experienced non-profits and lacks knowledge of where to seek support and technical assistance Ø Project timeline does not reflect realistic and achievable benchmarks
ACCESS TO FUNDING	(0-5) x 2	 Applicant is engaged in raising money from additional funding sources While applicant and/or project has additional funding sources, they face barriers to more mainstream sources of funding because of the values centered nature of their project 	 Applicant is not pursuing additional funding sources or has very limited additional funding prospects Applicant and/or project is a strong fit for other mainstream sources of funding and does not face barriers in accessing this funding

EXTRA CREDIT

In addition to the evaluation rubric above, applications will receive extra credit points for every funding priority they meet (2 points each per priority):

- Organizational leadership (i.e. board of directors or other leadership body) is 51% or more people of color
- Project has clear leadership from people with disabilities or is accountable to a leadership body that is 51% or more people with disabilities
- While our criteria states that we are looking for organizations that provide affordable housing for households making 0-45% AMI, we will award extra credit to projects that go beyond this and provide affordable housing for households making 0-30%AMI
- Provide low-barrier housing to people with criminal records, bad credit history, and eviction records
- Project is located in a high risk displacement neighborhood as defined by the Seattle
 2035 Equity Analysis