



Scoring Rubric

Supported By

MacArthur
Foundation

#1 IMPACTFUL

Does the proposal describe an urgent problem worth solving, and will the solution have a transformative impact? Is the proposal sufficiently ambitious either in its progress toward a solution; the number of direct beneficiaries served; the size of the geography served; or intensity of impact on a small but vulnerable population or geography?

MINIMAL	
0.1-0.9	Failed to present an adequate, well-timed solution to a substantive problem; approach struggles to achieve results with no indication of positive impact; insufficiently ambitious.
1.1-1.9	Described a cautious solution to a problem that lacks scope or timeliness; approach achieves only marginal results lacking in both depth and breadth; nominally ambitious.
2.1-2.9	Presented an appropriate solution to a serious and pressing problem; approach shows promising impact with limited breadth or depth; acceptable level of ambition.
3.1-3.9	Conveyed an effective solution to a difficult and dire problem; approach describes substantial impact with either considerable breadth or depth; significant level of ambition.
4.1-5.0	Illustrated a powerful solution to a compelling and crucial problem; approach delivers impressive impact with both breadth and depth; exceptional level of ambition.
TRANSFORMATIVE	

#2 EVIDENCE-BASED

Does the proposal present evidence that the solution or critical components of it have previously yielded practical and concrete results? Does the evidence suggest that the solution can be adapted to other contexts, such as expanding to new populations or geographies, or to reach a greater number of people over time, and still retain its effectiveness?

QUESTIONABLE	
0.1-0.9	Lacked evidence that the solution or any of its components have previously yielded practical, concrete results; no evidence that the solution can be adapted to other contexts.
1.1-1.9	Presented evidence that some components of the solution have previously worked in limited contexts; showed some signs of ability to adapt but evidence is unconvincing.
2.1-2.9	Established reasonable record of results for more than one component of the solution; provided a clear path towards adapting to other contexts with solid, reliable evidence.
3.1-3.9	Presented rigorous evidence that each of the components of the solution have worked in specific contexts; delivered compelling evidence of ability to adapt to other contexts.
4.1-5.0	Offered rigorous evidence that the solution has previously yielded practical and concrete results; made a strong case for adapting it to other contexts.
CONVINCING	

#3 FEASIBLE

Does the team have the skills, capacity, relationships, and experience to deliver its proposal? Do the budget and project plan represent a realistic understanding of a successful implementation of the solution? Does the proposal outline a mitigation plan for risks associated with changes in key personnel and political, market, or social environments?

UNREALISTIC	
0.1-0.9	Failed to demonstrate a cohesive team with capabilities to deliver the proposed solution; presented an impractical budget and/or project plan; no mitigation plan for risks.
1.1-1.9	Described a team with basic abilities but lacking in knowledge or training; offered an insufficient budget and/or project plan; minimal mitigation planning.
2.1-2.9	Proposed a competent, qualified team with clear strengths; presented a realistic budget and project plan with sufficient attention to detail; adequate mitigation planning.
3.1-3.9	Presented a team of accomplished professionals with a record of success; budget and project plan were detailed, measurable, and cost effective; thorough mitigation planning.
4.1-5.0	Led by an experienced team of qualified experts who have achieved remarkable results; budget and project plan grounded in past success; comprehensive mitigation planning.
ACHIEVABLE	

#4 DURABLE

Will the solution have a sustained impact? Does the solution either expect to solve a problem in five years or create a pathway to solving the problem over time? Will the project elicit support from other sources – private, philanthropic or public? Has the team advanced a clear, cogent, and compelling vision for the future?

TEMPORARY	
0.1-0.9	Offered a solution with little to no long-term impact; presented no opportunities to elicit support from other sources; no vision for the future.
1.1-1.9	Offered a solution that requires continual investment for sustained impact with low probability of ongoing support from other sources; hazy vision for future.
2.1-2.9	Offered a solution with a well-defined pathway toward sustainability; ongoing support is possible but not assured; vision for the future is not realistic.
3.1-3.9	Proposed a solution with a plausible, well-defined pathway toward sustainability; ongoing support, if needed, seems probable; vision for the future is compelling and realistic.
4.1-5.0	Proposed an enduring solution; ongoing support, if required, is nearly guaranteed; vision for future is compelling and attainable.
PERMANENT	