Built Environment Policy Advocacy Fund (BEPAF) – Scoring Rubric for Letters of Interest and Full Proposals

Applicant: ___________________________ Date Reviewed: _____________ Reviewer ID: ____________________

**LEVEL 1 REVIEW: ELIGIBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Criteria</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No (ineligible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the lead applicant a tax-exempt organization under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code or an organization that is fiscally sponsored by a 501(c)(3)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the applicant have staff available to work on this project based in Los Angeles County?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No (ineligible) 
Reviewer comments:  

Has the applicant clearly identified one (or more) of the 14 Best Start geographies where the project will take place?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No (ineligible) 

**Indicate the Best Start area(s) (check all that apply):**  
☐ Broadway/Manchester  ☐ Metro LA  ☐ Southeast LA County Cities  
☐ Central Long Beach  ☐ Northeast San Fernando Valley  ☐ Watts/Willowbrook  
☐ Compton-East Compton  ☐ Palmdale  ☐ West Athens  
☐ East LA  ☐ Panorama City and Neighbors  ☐ Wilmington  
☐ Lancaster  ☐ South El Monte/El Monte  ☐ Not entirely clear (follow-up needed)  

Reviewer verification that the application is eligible:  
☐ LOI is eligible  ☐ LOI is ineligible

**Compliance with RFP Guidelines**  
Does the proposal meet the specified formatting guidelines and include all additional required documents?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No (PI will follow up with applicant regarding missing documents if time remains before the submission deadline)

**LEVEL 2 REVIEW: SELECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Areas</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear and Compelling Problem Statement, Rationale, and Analysis</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Community Relationships and Community Capacity</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Project Work Plan and Approach</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated Organizational and Staff Capacity</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Budget and Budget Narrative</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Scale**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Range</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85 – 100% of maximum score</td>
<td>Excellent qualifications in specified area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 84% of maximum score</td>
<td>Average qualifications in specified area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 60% of maximum score</td>
<td>Poor qualifications in specified area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Clear and Compelling Problem Statement, Rationale, and Analysis**

*Criteria*

- The applicant is able to clearly convey the built environment problems and inequities related to at least one of the program’s three priority areas (parks and open space, transportation/mobility, and food security), as well as linkages to other equity issues facing the community (or communities) where the proposed project will take place.
- The applicant demonstrates an understanding of the built environment landscape/context in which they are working and the potential policy- and systems-change opportunities that exist.
- The applicant communicates a depth of analysis of how the built environment landscape/context in which they are working affects the development and health of children prenatal to age five and their families. The proposed project would advance policy- and systems-change advocacy innovation to improve equitable access for children prenatal to age five and their families to high-quality parks and open space, transportation/mobility, and/or food security.

**Rating scale:**

| 17-20 points = Excellent | 13-16 points = Average | 0-12 points = Poor |

**Score:** ____ *(maximum score = 20)*

**Reviewer comments:**

2. **Evidence of Community Relationships and Community Capacity**

*Criteria*

- The applicant has a demonstrated track record of working in and with low-income communities and/or communities of color, and has leadership, membership, and/or constituency that reflect the populations served. The proposal includes strategies to engage individuals, including parents in the Best Start geographies, most impacted by the problem in leadership roles.
- The broader community has access to organizational and/or community assets to build upon and resources that can be leveraged to address these problems including but not limited to: resident members; organizational partners; support from agencies, elected officials, or academic institutions; existing baseline policies; and other funding resources.

**Rating scale:**

| 21-25 points = Excellent | 16-20 points = Average | 0-15 points = Poor |

**Score:** ____ *(maximum score = 25)*

**Reviewer comments:**

3. **Sound Project Work Plan and Approach**

*Criteria*

- The proposed methodology for achieving the outcomes is clear, cogent, and ideally reflects best practices in power-building and community-driven policy advocacy practice, including but not limited to: base-building/community organizing; community engagement and coalition-building; resident or member capacity-building and leadership development; research and policy/strategy development; and communications and narrative change.
- The proposed project has the potential to:
  - Create the conditions conducive for policy- and systems-change advocacy that advances built environment equity;
  - Increase built environment policy- and systems-change advocacy capacity for the applicant, its coalition members, and/or parents/residents in Best Start geographies;
  - Increase community organizing and/or community engagement capacity for the applicant, its coalition members, and/or parents/residents in Best Start geographies;
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- Increase parent/resident capacity to engage in built environment policy- and systems-change advocacy in Best Start geographies; and
- Demonstrate establishment of new connections to and among the ecosystem of built environment policy advocates in LA County.

**For Policy Implementation Grants Only** The proposed project has the potential to result in significant and measurable progress towards the adoption of new policies/practices, changes to existing policies/practices, or oversight of policy implementation to advance equity related to parks and open space, transportation/mobility, and/or food security.

**Rating scale:**

| 21-25 points = Excellent | 16-20 points = Average | 0-15 points = Poor |

**Score:** ____ (maximum score = 25)

Reviewer comments:

4. Demonstrated Organizational and Staff Capacity

**Criteria**

- **For Policy Incubation Grants Only** The applicant is committed to policy- and systems-change advocacy and demonstrates a successful track record of at least two years in community-driven policy- and systems-change advocacy work.

- **For Policy Implementation Grants Only** The applicant demonstrates a successful track record of at least two years in community-driven policy advocacy to advance equity in the built environment related to parks and open space, transportation/mobility, or food security.

- The applicant organization has demonstrated administrative infrastructure and fiscal management capacity to support successful policy- and systems-change advocacy work.

- The applicant and its partners have the commitment and articulated willingness to invest organizational resources to fundraise to sustain the work beyond the grant period.

**Rating scale:**

| 13-15 points = Excellent | 10-12 points = Average | 0-9 points = Poor |

**Score:** ____ (maximum score = 15)

Reviewer comments:

5. Reasonable Budget and Budget Narrative

**Criteria**

- The budget is realistic for the activities proposed and does not include any of the non-allowable expenses/activities specified in the Use of Grant Funds section of the RFP.

- The requested amount does not represent more than 25% of the applicant organization’s total annual budget.

- The budget narrative clearly justifies all costs included in the budget.

**Rating scale:**

| 13-15 points = Excellent | 10-12 points = Average | 0-9 points = Poor |

**Score:** ____ (maximum score = 15)

Reviewer comments:
### Summary of Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score (maximum points possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clear and Compelling Problem Statement, Rationale, and Analysis</td>
<td>____ (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evidence of Community Relationships and Community Capacity</td>
<td>____ (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demonstrated Organizational and Staff Capacity</td>
<td>____ (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reasonable Budget and Budget Narrative</td>
<td>____ (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE:** ____________ (maximum score = 100)

**APPLICANT’S FINAL SCORING CATEGORY:**

___ Excellent (85-100 points)
___ Average (61-84 points)
___ Poor (0-60 points)

**REVIEWER’S RECOMMENDATION FOR WHETHER TO INVITE THE APPLICATION TO SUBMIT A FULL PROPOSAL:**

___ Yes
___ Maybe
___ No

**REVIEWER COMMENTS:**

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________