

CFGV Community Grant Cycle Review Process and Criteria

Your application is reviewed based on content submitted. Remember that the Review Committee will include up- and down-Valley members, full- and part-time residents. Do not assume that they know about your organization, your part of the Valley or the issues that your organization addresses.

While the core of your application package is the completed narrative and all required attachments, the reviewers have access to two additional items. These are your most recent CFGV Community Grant Report (if applicable) and the written comments that were provided to you in the most recent grant application feedback session that you had with Foundation staff (if applicable). Reviewers are permitted to ask staff whether past concerns were addressed.

Review and Scoring: Staff first reviews your application for eligibility. Applications that are late, propose something that the Foundation does not fund, or are not compliant in state and federal filings will not be reviewed by the committee. In addition, applicants are automatically penalized if they have submitted a late final report, an IRS letter older than five years, incomplete financial documents, or are missing special attachments required for certain types of applications. (These special attachments are for applicants whose mission is religious; for applicants proposing to offer scholarships or to subsidize costs; for applicants submitting a proposal for marketing; and for applicants proposing school activities. Please refer to the attachment list on the FluidReview site where these Guidelines are posted, or call the office and request the grant application attachment list).

A review committee reflective of the diversity of the Valley reads, discusses and scores all applications as follows. Points are awarded in each of the four broad areas, and questions like those below will inform the reviewers' scores:

1. Purpose (up to 25 points)

- Is this application consistent with the applicant's mission?
- Is it consistent with the Foundation's vision of addressing the "full range of human needs"?
- For general operating support applicants, is it clear what the organization does? For project support applicants, is it evident what the elements of the project are?

2. Community Impact (up to 25 points)

- Is the issue clear and described so that reviewers can understand its relevance and importance?
- Does the applicant evaluate its activities in a way that clearly demonstrates that it is making the difference it articulates?
- Does the application clearly demonstrate direct local impact (beyond a general economic impact)?
- Does the applicant demonstrate a willingness to collaborate with others?
- Does the applicant successfully attract volunteers, if applicable?

3. Governance (up to 25 points)

- If the applicant is a 501(c)(3) organization, does the applicant provide evidence of board oversight and accountability?
- Is there a regularly updated strategic plan?
- Is there a process for identifying new board members so that the organization can evolve? (In the case of public entities, where the “board” may be elected officials, is there an active advisory group that helps guide the agency or program?)
- Does the application reflect strategies for organizational and/or program sustainability through use of best practices?

4. Financial Management (up to 25 points)

- If an audit or financial review is warranted, has there been one? If an audit is not warranted, are policies in place that demonstrate sound board accountability for financial management?
- Are sound financial management practices evident?
- Are the financial uploads of the grant applicant realistic, understandable, and consistent with the application narrative?

The Grant Review Committee’s scores and funding recommendations are forwarded to the Board of the Foundation for final grant award decisions.