

SCP CEEEJ Application Scoring Rubric

Scoring Criteria Summary

Scoring Criteria		Points
General Project Information and Eligibility		Not scored
1	Project Design & Outcomes	20
1.1	Community and Vision Summary	
1.2	Funding Objectives & SCS Implementation	
1.3	Anticipated Project Outcomes	
1.4	Scope of Work & Project Feasibility	
2	Project Need & Priority Population Benefits	10
2.1	Priority Populations	
2.2	Addressing Historic/Current Inequities & Priority Population Benefit	
3	Inclusive & Equitable Engagement	10
3.1	Priority Populations Engagement & Letters of Support	
3.2	Inclusive, Diverse & Equitable Engagement	
4	Local Partnerships	10
4.1	Reciprocal Relationships and Impact	
4.2	Governance & Decision-making	
Total Points		50

1. Project Design and Outcomes (20 points)

1.1 *Community and Vision Summary (5 points)*

Points	Community and Vision Summary	Score
5 Points	Application presents an excellent description of a transformative and catalytic project, identifies significant community needs, and clearly describes how the project will address the needs. Applicant provides three or more (3+) examples of how the project will address identified community needs as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application presents a strong description of a transformative and catalytic project, identifies related community needs, and somewhat describes how the project will address the needs. Applicant provides two or more (2+) examples as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application presents a suitable description of a transformative and catalytic project, identifies some related community needs, and an adequate description of how the project will address the needs. Applicant provides one or more (1+) examples as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application presents a limited description of a transformative and catalytic project and does not adequately identify community needs or how the project will address the needs. Applicant provides at least one (1) example as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application presents a weak or no description of a transformative and catalytic project and does not adequately identify community needs or how the project will address the needs. Applicant does not provide any examples.	For Reviewer Only

1.2 *Funding Objectives and SCS Implementation (5 points)*

Points	REAP 2.0 Objectives and SCS Implementation	Score
5 Points	Application presents an excellent description of how the project directly addresses all funding objectives by project category and a detailed description of three or more (3+) Connect SoCal strategies they are currently implementing or plan to implement within the community as part of the project.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application presents a strong description of how the project directly addresses all funding objectives by project category and a description of two or more (2+) Connect SoCal strategy they are currently implementing or plan to implement within the community as part of the project.	

	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application presents a suitable description of how the project directly addresses all funding objectives by project category and a description of one or more (1+) Connect SoCal strategy they are currently implementing or plan to implement within the community as part of the project.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application presents a limited description of how the project directly addresses all funding objectives by project category and an inadequate description of at least one (1) of the Connect SoCal strategies they are currently implementing or plan to implement within the community as part of the project.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application presents a weak or does not address how the proposed project addresses the funding objectives or Connect SoCal strategies.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only

1.3 Anticipated Project Outcomes (5 points)

Points	Anticipated Project Outcomes	Score
5 Points	Application presents an excellent description of all target outcomes in measurable terms that directly respond to the identified community need and are in alignment with the funding objectives.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application presents a strong description of two or more (2+) target outcome in measurable terms that directly respond to the identified community need and are in alignment with the funding objectives.	

	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application presents a suitable description of at least one (1) target outcome that somewhat responds to the identified community need and is in alignment with the funding objectives.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application presents a limited description of at least one (1) target outcome and does not adequately respond to the identified community need and is not in direct alignment with the funding objectives.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application presents a weak or no description of target outcomes and does not respond to the identified community need and is not in alignment with the funding objectives.	
	Housing & Land Use Strategies	For Reviewer Only
	Multimodal Communities	For Reviewer Only

1.4 Scope of Work (SOW) and Project Feasibility (5 points)

Points	Scope of Work & Project Feasibility	Score
5 Points	Application presents an excellent description of the project scope of work, including a clear and detailed timeline, tasks, deliverables, and budget, how the project is designed to meet the target outcomes, and demonstrates project readiness by describing two or more (2+) examples of existing efforts such as engagement, policies, contracts, etc. completed or in progress to support the project.	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application presents a strong description of the project scope of work, including a clear timeline, tasks, deliverables, and budget, how the project is designed to meet the target outcomes, and demonstrates project readiness by describing one or more (1+) examples completed or in progress to support the project.	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application presents a suitable description of the project scope of work, including a timeline, tasks, deliverables, and budget, how the project is designed to meet	For Reviewer Only

	the target outcomes, and demonstrates some project readiness by describing at least one (1) example completed or in progress to support the project.	
2 Points	Application presents a limited description of the project scope of work, including a timeline, tasks, deliverables, and budget, how the project is designed to meet the target outcomes, and demonstrates some project readiness, but does not provide any example.	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application presents a weak or no description of the project scope of work, how the project is designed to meet the target outcomes and does not demonstrate project readiness.	For Reviewer Only

2. Project Need and Priority Population Benefits (10 points)

2.1 *Priority Populations (5 points)*

Points	Priority Populations	Score
5 Points	Application identifies a targeted area that will directly benefit Priority Populations and provides a map of the location. The project area is located in and will directly benefit three or more (3+) Priority Populations.	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application identifies a targeted area that will directly benefit Priority Populations and provides a map of the location. The project area is located in and will directly benefit two or more (2+) Priority Populations.	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application identifies a targeted area that will benefit Priority Populations and provides a map of the location. The project area is located in and will directly benefit one or more (1+) Priority Populations.	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application identifies a targeted area that will benefit Priority Populations and provides a map of the location. The project area is located in and will benefit at least one (1) Priority Populations.	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	The project area is not located in and does not provide direct benefit to Priority Populations. Applicant does not provide a map of the location.	For Reviewer Only

2.2 *Repairing Historic/Current Inequities & Priority Population Benefits (5 points)*

Points	Repairing Historic/Current Inequities & Priority Population Benefits	Score
5 Points	Application presents an excellent description of how the project aims to address and repair historic and/or current inequities and how it benefits Priority Populations. Applicant provides three or more (3+) examples of how the project addresses inequities and benefits Priority Populations as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application presents a strong description of how the project aims to address and repair historic and/or current inequities and how it benefits Priority Populations. Applicant provides two or more (2+) examples as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application presents a suitable description of how the project aims to address and repair historic and/or current inequities and how it benefits Priority Populations. Applicant provides one or more (1+) examples as part of description.	For Reviewer Only

2 Points	Application presents a limited description of how the project aims to address and repair historic and/or current inequities and how it benefits Priority Populations. Applicant provides at least one (1) example as part of description.	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application presents a weak or no description of how the project aims to address and repair historic and/or current inequities or benefits Priority Populations. Applicant does not provide any examples.	For Reviewer Only

3. Inclusive and Equitable Engagement (10 points)

3.1 *Inclusive, Diverse, and Equitable Engagement (5 points)*

Points	Inclusive, Diverse, and Equitable Engagement	Score
5 Points	Application provides exceptional description of approach to equitable community engagement during early project development and throughout project lifecycle, and provides letters of support. as described as part of question 3.2.	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application provides strong description of approach to equitable community engagement during early project development and throughout project lifecycle and provides letters of support. .	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application provides suitable description of approach to equitable community engagement during early project development and throughout project lifecycle and provides letters of support.,.	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application provides suitable description of approach to equitable community engagement and provides letters of support. .	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application provides weak description of approach to equitable community engagement, proposes few or no engagement strategies, and includes no letters of support.	For Reviewer Only

3.2 *Priority Populations Engagement (5 points)*

Points	Priority Populations Engagement	Score
5 Points	Applicant(s) provide exceptional description of how they will engage stakeholders in Priority Population areas during project development and throughout the project lifecycle, as described as part of question 3.1	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Applicant(s) provide strong description of how stakeholders in Priority Population areas will be engaged during project development and throughout the project lifecycle.	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Applicant(s) provide suitable description of how stakeholders in Priority Population areas will be engaged.	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Applicant(s) provide limited description of how stakeholders in Priority Population areas will be engaged.	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Applicant(s) provide weak description of how stakeholders in Priority Populations areas will be engaged.	For Reviewer Only

4. Local Partnerships (10 points)

4.1 Reciprocal Relationships and Impact (5 points)

Points	Reciprocal Relationships and Impact	Score
5 Points	Application includes one to two (1-2) Co-Applicants and provides an exceptional description of the roles and responsibilities of the Primary Applicant, any Co-Applicant(s), and any additional local partners. Provides robust detail for how the collaboration will meaningfully benefit each Co-Applicant, any additional partners, and the community. Proposes detailed plan for sustainability of the partnership beyond the project. If additional community partners (not including Co-Applicants) play an active role in the project, compensation is accounted for.	For Reviewer Only
4 Points	Application includes one to two (1-2) Co-Applicants and provides a strong description of the roles and responsibilities of the Primary Applicant, any Co-Applicant(s), and any additional local partners. Provides some detail for how the collaboration will meaningfully benefit each Co-Applicant, any additional partners, and the community. Proposes loose plan for sustainability of the partnership beyond the project. If additional community partners (not including Co-Applicants) play an active role in the project, compensation is accounted for.	For Reviewer Only
3 Points	Application includes one to two (1-2) Co-Applicants and provides a suitable description of the roles and responsibilities of the Primary Applicant, any Co-Applicant(s), and any additional local partners. Provides some detail for how the collaboration will meaningfully benefit each Co-Applicant, any additional partners, and the community. Does not discuss the sustainability of the partnership beyond the project. If additional community partners (not including Co-Applicants) play an active role in the project, compensation is accounted for.	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application does not include any Co-Applicants and provides a limited description of the roles and responsibilities of the Primary Applicant and any partners. Provides limited detail for how the collaboration will meaningfully benefit any local partners and the community. Does not discuss the sustainability of the partnership beyond the project. If additional community partners (not including Co-Applicants) play an active role in the project, compensation is <i>not</i> accounted for.	For Reviewer Only
1 Point	Application does not include any Co-Applicants and provides a weak description of the roles and responsibilities of the Primary Applicant and any partners. Does not provide detail for how the collaboration will meaningfully benefit any local partners or the community. Does not discuss the sustainability of the partnership beyond the project. If additional community partners (not including Co-Applicants) play an active role in the project, compensation is <i>not</i> accounted for.	For Reviewer Only

4.2 Governance and Decision-Making (5 points)

Points	Governance and Decision-Making	Score
5 Points	Application provides an exceptional description of a collaborative governance and decision-making structure between partners, or how these will be developed by partners. Clearly outlines decision-making processes, communication protocols, and mechanisms for holding partners to account, or how these will be developed	For Reviewer Only

	by partners. Clearly describes how scope and budget reinforce partnership structure. Prioritizes building trust between partners and proposes strategies.	
4 Points	Application provides a strong description of a collaborative governance and decision-making structure between partners, or how these will be developed by partners. Clearly outlines loose decision-making processes, communication protocols, and mechanisms for holding partners to account, or how these will be developed by partners. Clearly describes how scope and budget reinforce partnership structure.	For Reviewer Only
A3 Points	Application provides a suitable description of a collaborative governance and decision-making structure between partners, or how these will be developed by partners. Loosely outlines decision-making processes, communication protocols, and mechanisms for holding partners to account, or how these will be developed by partners. Describes how scope and budget reinforce partnership structure.	For Reviewer Only
2 Points	Application provides a limited description of a collaborative governance and decision-making structure between partners, or how these will be developed by partners. Does not outline any decision-making processes, communication protocols, or mechanisms for holding partners to account, or how these will be developed by partners. Loosely describes how scope and budget reinforce partnership structure.	For Reviewer Only
1 Points	Application provides a weak description of a collaborative governance and decision-making structure between partners, or how these will be developed by partners. Does not outline any decision-making processes, communication protocols, or mechanisms for holding partners to account, or how these will be developed by partners. Does not describe how scope and budget reinforce partnership structure.	For Reviewer Only