

CAPACITY BUILDING FOR BIBLE INSTITUTES GRANT EVALUATION RUBRIC

This rubric is intended to assist the grant requestor in understanding the criteria considered when the Capacity Building Grant Advisory Council (GAC) reviews grant proposals. All grant proposals must align to the Capacity Building's grant purpose to be eligible for approval. Purpose: *The purpose of the project is to build the administrative and management capacity of Bible institutes to help them meet certification standards or improve their internal capacity. This includes developing strategic plans, financial policies, revising curricular offerings, and enhancing leadership and organizational proficiency.*

	Exemplary (1 to 3)	Acceptable (4 to 6)	Developing (7 to 9)	SCORE
CRITERIA				
Detailed Budget	Funding model is realistic. Project has clear oversight. Provided documentation is substantial. Financial request is clear and comprehensive; request is appropriate for activities proposed.	Project has limited oversight and documentation. Financial request is explained but limited for the activities proposed. The reviewer has at least one question about the funding model.	Funding model is problematic. Insufficient financial oversight and documentation. Financial request is not clearly explained nor appropriate for activities proposed.	
Program Collaboration	Proposal enhances and describes specific roles and types of collaboration. Includes all evidence needed.	Limited collaboration for the program and instruction for learning. Limited description of the roles and type of collaboration.	Description is unclear about the type and roles in the collaboration.	
Program Descriptor	Execution of the project is clear and describes the desired outcomes and the different phases involved in implementing and running the project.	Proposal provides limited information on the execution and the desired outcomes.	Proposal provides insufficient details on the execution and the desired outcomes.	
Program Timeline	The timeline is outlined, reasonable, and includes major benchmarks for assessing progress. It seems the project stands a good chance for success.	The timeline includes a limited number of benchmarks for assessing progress. The reviewer has at least one question about the timeline and its likelihood of completion.	The timeline is included and either lacks major benchmarks for assessing progress or the timeline seems unreasonable.	
Success Evaluation Plan (KPI's)	Project has clear mechanisms in place to measure effectiveness and the impact on the overall institute and community served.	Project has limited mechanisms in place to measure effectiveness of program and the impact on the overall institute and community served.	Project has no mechanisms in place to measure effectiveness of program.	
Sustainability Plan	The proposal has a specific plan for continued funding and / or self-sustaining the program after the grant period has ended. Includes all evidence needed.	The proposal provides limited evidence of a plan for continued funding and / or self-sustaining the program after the grant period has ended.	Plan is unrealistic, lacks evidence, misaligned with project.	

TOTAL SCORE= _____

Cumulative Score for Awarding Funds: HIGH (6 - 18) * MEDIUM (19 – 36) * LOW (37 – 54)