## **Microgrant Application Scoring Rubric**

|                      | 0               | 1                    | 2                 | 3                |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Application to       | not relevant    | slightly aligned     | moderately        | extremely        |
| Common               |                 |                      | aligned           | aligned          |
| Agenda               |                 |                      |                   |                  |
| Justification        | unconvincing    | weak presentation    | rationale too     | strong rationale |
|                      | or no evidence  | of institutional or  | general, but      | and significance |
|                      | of need         | community need       | overall           | of               |
|                      | presented       |                      | argument holds    | proposed work    |
| Sustainability       | singular event/ | event(s)/program(s)  | training, policy, | training, policy |
|                      | program         | with continuity plan | or                | or environmental |
|                      |                 | in place             | environmental     | change with      |
|                      |                 |                      | change            | continuity plan  |
|                      |                 |                      |                   | in place         |
| Adhere to            | proven to be    | unknown              | best/wise         | best/wise        |
| Best/Wise Practices  | ineffective in  | effectiveness        | practice,         | practice, proven |
|                      | literature      |                      | promising results | effective        |
| Adhere to Equity     | no intentional  | slightly developed   | moderately        | well-developed,  |
| and Inclusion        | inclusion       | inclusion plan       | developed         | substantial      |
| Values               |                 |                      | inclusion plan    | inclusion plan   |
| Size of Organization | 1-30            | 31-50                | 51-100            | 101+             |
| Evaluation           | no evaluation   | minimal evaluation   | moderately        | well-developed,  |
|                      | plan or success | plan                 | developed         | substantial      |
|                      | difficult to    |                      | evaluation plan   | evaluation plan  |
|                      | measure         |                      |                   |                  |

## **Best/Wise Practices**

Successful Micro Grant projects align with Best Practices, which are practices that are supported by findings in academic literature. For example, some best practices include normalizing help-seeking behaviors, implementing a regular mindfulness practice and conducting restorative practices.

## **Equity & Inclusion**

We strongly emphasize equity and inclusion as a cornerstone of award-worthy projects. Recipient organizations can address equity in several ways, including prioritizing accessibility, collaborating with identity-based or cultural organizations, reducing financial barriers, and creating an inclusive space for all members to feel welcome.

## Evaluation

Successful applications detail a plan to measure success. Applicants should consider the main objectives of their Micro Grant and design an assessment accordingly. Evaluation can be done in a variety of ways, depending on the scope of the project. For an event or training, this often includes a pre- and post-event

| survey. For a policy or environment change, RSO leaders can track measures like meeting attendan member retention. | ice or |
|--|--------|
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |
|  |        |