

RATING FACTORS	
Project Need: The applicant articulated a need that is pertinent to the intent of the grant program	1.1 Proposal included description of the need to be addressed. 1.2 If applicable, proposal identified target population for grant funded services (e.g., gender, charge type, collateral needs). <ul style="list-style-type: none">Included reason why target population was selected. 1.3 Proposal identified service gaps that contribute to project need. 1.4 Proposal included description of how need was identified or determined. 1.5 Proposal provided relevant qualitative and/or quantitative data in support of the project need.
Project Description: The applicant provided a clear, comprehensive description of the proposed project and how it will address the identified need.	2.1 Project goals and objectives were presented with clarity. 2.2 Proposal included description of how project aligns with holistic defense principles. 2.3 Applicant specified activities and services to be implemented and at what scale. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Timelines and deliverables were included in description. 2.4 Applicant provided evidence supporting efficacy of proposed approach/model. 2.5 If applicable, applicant included a description of multidisciplinary staff that will be hired or utilized, and their qualifications, experience and roles.
Capacity & Sustainability: The applicant demonstrated organizational capacity to implement the project and sustain it beyond the grant period.	3.1 Applicant demonstrated the ability to manage similar projects or funding. 3.2 Applicant demonstrated appropriate administrative and fiscal infrastructure to support project oversight. 3.3 Proposal included plans for training, supervision, and ongoing staff development. 3.4 Proposal included strategies to sustain project elements after the grant period (e.g., leveraging partnerships, funding sources, or institutional support).
Data Collection: The applicant provided a plan for data collection and evaluation to measure outcomes and inform continuous improvement.	4.1 The proposal described clearly what data will be collected (e.g., case outcomes, client demographics, service utilization), and how the data that is collected aligns with project goals. 4.2 Proposal defined how impact will be measured (e.g., reduced recidivism, improved family stability, client satisfaction). 4.3 Proposal described how data will be collected, managed and stored. 4.4 Proposal included consideration of equity in data (e.g., disaggregating results by race/ethnicity, gender, language or other relevant factors in applicant’s service community).
Project Budget: The applicant provided a reasonable, well-justified budget aligned with the project goals.	5.1 Budget was clearly tied to activities described in the proposal. 5.2 Budget included adequate justification for each line item, including staffing, services, and overhead. 5.3 Budget costs were reasonable and reflect efficient use of resources. 5.4 Applicant identified any matching funds, leveraged resources, or in-kind contributions, if applicable, that contribute to project feasibility. 5.5 Budget narrative demonstrated alignment between requested funds and anticipated outcomes.