

Appendix 1 Niagara Prosperity Initiative Grant Program: Scoring Matrix (Under Development)

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)
Alignment with Niagara Poverty Reduction Strategy Objective(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submission is clearly aligned with poverty prevention and reduction objective(s) and identified in a manner that is impactful Clearly supports individuals and/or families that are living in poverty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submission is mostly aligned with poverty prevention and reduction objective(s) and identified in a manner that is somewhat impactful Somewhat supports individuals and/or families that are living in poverty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The submission lacks full alignment with poverty prevention and reduction objective(s) and has some alignment but unlikely to be impactful Lacks evidence that the application would support individuals and/or families that are living in poverty.
Target Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target population is clearly identified using sociodemographic descriptors (i.e., age, gender, race and/or other factors are provided) The program/initiative is likely to have a high level of impact on people living in poverty Target population is clearly identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target population is somewhat identified (may be missing some sociodemographic descriptors) The program/initiative is likely to achieve a moderate level of impact on people living in poverty. Target population is mostly clear with some minor information gaps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Target population is not clear (there are multiple sociodemographic descriptors missing or none at all) The program/initiative is likely to achieve minimal or no impact on people living in poverty. Target population is not clear or there are significant information gaps
Evidence of Need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly demonstrates a need for the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly demonstrates a need for the proposal through somewhat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not demonstrate a need for the proposal

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)
	<p>through strong use of evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence provided is congruent with the need that will be addressed by the program/initiative (i.e., identified need and project outcomes are highly aligned) • Evidence provided is appropriate for the nature of the request; if evidence is unavailable the applicant has demonstrated how they will contribute to improving the availability of evidence of the issue • The proposal clearly demonstrates how the program/initiative will address a gap in services or will complement existing services • The applicant has clearly identified why the program/initiative should be considered a priority in Niagara 	<p>satisfactory use of evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence provided is mostly/somewhat congruent with the need that will be addressed by the program/initiative (i.e., identified need and project outcomes are mostly/somewhat aligned) • Evidence provided is mostly appropriate for the nature of the request; if evidence is unavailable the applicant has somewhat demonstrated how they will contribute to improving the availability of evidence of the issue • The proposal somewhat demonstrates how the program/initiative will address a gap in services or will complement existing services • The applicant has mostly/somewhat identified why the program/initiative should 	<p>through use of evidence, or evidence is weak</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evidence provided lacks congruency with the need that will be addressed by the program/initiative (i.e., identified need and program outcomes are poorly aligned) • Evidence provided is not appropriate for the nature of the request; if evidence is unavailable the applicant has not demonstrated how they will contribute to improving the availability of evidence of the issue • The proposal does not demonstrate how the program/initiative will address a gap in services or will complement existing services; the proposal may duplicate current services • The applicant has made only a limited case (or not at all) for why the

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)
Program Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a high likelihood that the program/initiative will be sustainable beyond the funding period <p>(e.g., clear rationale for how the program will be sustained; program has partners that contribute substantial resources or in-kind contributions; diversified program revenues; builds on a social enterprise model; if the request is for an existing program, there has not been a decrease in revenues over the past 12 months)</p>	<p>be considered a priority in Niagara</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is somewhat likely that the program/initiative will be sustained beyond the funding period <p>(e.g., some rationale for how the program will be sustained; program has partners that contribute some resources or in-kind contributions; somewhat diversified program revenues/projections; if the request is for an existing program, there has not been a significant decrease in revenues over the past 12 months)</p>	<p>program/initiative should be a priority in Niagara</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unlikely that the program/initiative will be sustained beyond the funding period <p>(e.g., limited or no rationale for how the program will be sustained; program does not have partners that contribute resources or in-kind contributions; very little revenue diversification /projected revenue diversification; if the request is for an existing program, there has been a significant decrease in revenues over the past 12 months)</p>
Use of Funds/ Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed use of resources is efficient • Budget is specific and realistic • Budget is clearly aligned with program/initiative activities/outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed use of resources is mostly/somewhat efficient • Budget is mostly specific and realistic, but requires further clarity in some areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed use of resources lacks efficiency • Budget is incomplete, lacks clarity or is unrealistic • Budget lacks alignment with program/initiative activities/outcomes

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is somewhat/mostly aligned with program/initiative activities/outcomes 	
Work Plan: Goals Activities Targets/Objectives Evaluation Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear work plan with alignment between goals, targets, activities, and evaluation methods Targets/objectives are achievable/realistic and are likely to result in a high level of impact Targets/objectives are specific/measurable Clear and realistic evaluation plan; evaluation methods are aligned with the targets/objectives they are intended to measure There is a clear link between the work plan and other components of the application Overall, the work plan demonstrates a clear approach to implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly clear work plan with moderate alignment between goals, targets, activities and evaluation methods Targets/objectives are mostly/somewhat achievable/realistic and likely to result in a moderate level of impact Some targets/objectives are specific/measurable Mostly/somewhat clear and realistic evaluation plan; evaluation methods are mostly/somewhat aligned with the targets/objectives they are intended to measure There are links between most elements of the work plan and other components of the application Overall, the work plan demonstrates a mostly/somewhat clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work plan lacks clarity, weak alignment between goals, targets, activities, and evaluation methods Targets/objectives are not achievable/realistic and unlikely to result in meaningful impact Targets lack specificity/measurability Evaluation plan is not clear or realistic; evaluation methods lack alignment with targets/objectives they are intended to measure There are missing links between the work plan and other components of the application Overall, the work plan does not demonstrate a clear approach to implementation

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)
		<p>approach to implementation</p>	
<p>Overall Business Case</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a strong proposal with a high return on investment • If funded, the proposal is likely to result in a high level of impact • The proposal is addressing a high priority need in the community • It is likely that impact will be sustained beyond the funding period • If appropriate, the proposal demonstrates a highly collaborative approach • If appropriate, a letter(s) of support has been submitted by partner(s) essential for the delivery of the program/initiative • If appropriate, the application demonstrates that it reaches and supports diverse, equity-seeking or marginalized populations in Niagara • If appropriate, the proposal is based on best practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a somewhat strong proposal with a moderate return on investment • If funded, the proposal is likely to result in a moderate level of impact • The proposal is addressing a moderate level of need in the community • There is an opportunity for impact to last beyond the funding period • If appropriate, the proposal demonstrates a somewhat collaborative approach • If appropriate, a letter(s) of support has been submitted by most partner(s) essential for the delivery of the program/initiative • If appropriate, the application somewhat reaches and supports diverse, equity-seeking or marginalized populations in Niagara 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is weak and likely to result in a limited return on investment • If funded, the proposal is unlikely to result in significant impact • The proposal is not addressing a priority need in the community • Any potential impact will not be sustained beyond the funding period • A collaborative approach is appropriate for this program/initiative but is not demonstrated • If appropriate, a letter(s) of support has been submitted by only some or none of the partner(s) essential for the delivery of the program/initiative • The application does not reach and support diverse, equity-seeking or marginalized populations in Niagara, even though it

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)
	<p>or evidence-based practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the proposal is a high priority for investment by Niagara Region, as identified in the Niagara Poverty Reduction Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If appropriate, the proposal demonstrates some alignment to best practices or evidence-based practices Overall, the proposal is a medium range priority for investment by Niagara Region, as identified in the Niagara Poverty Reduction Strategy 	<p>would be appropriate to do so</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An approach based on best practices or evidence-based practices is appropriate for this program/initiative but is not demonstrated Overall, the proposal is a low range priority for investment by Niagara Region, as identified in the Niagara Poverty Reduction Strategy