GFC Harvest Grant Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	**4 (Excellent)** Strong, clear response with substantial evidence and alignment to goals.	**3 (Good):** Adequate response with most important details included.	**2 (Fair):** Basic response with gaps in clarity or depth.	**1 (Weak)**: Limited or unclear response.	**0 (Not Addressed):** No response or irrelevant answer.
Organization Overview	Clear background, mission, and purpose with strong connection to project goals.	Provides relevant background with sufficient explanation.	Basic background; mission and purpose unclear.	Vague or minimal explanation.	No response or not relevant.
Need	Well-defined and urgent need, supported by data or examples.	Identifies need clearly with some supporting details.	Need is mentioned but lacks clarity or detail.	Need is unclear or poorly supported.	No response or not relevant.
Plan	Detailed, realistic plan to address the identified need with clear actions.	Clear plan, but lacks some detail or specific steps.	General plan with vague or missing details.	Plan is unclear, unrealistic, or incomplete.	No response or not relevant.
Expected Outcomes	Clear, measurable results directly linked to project goals.	Results identified but lack full clarity or measurability.	Outcomes mentioned but are unclear or non-specific.	Expected results are unrealistic or unclear.	No response or not relevant.
Budget	Well-organized, realistic budget with clear breakdown and alignment to project goals.	Budget is clear but may lack some detail or justification.	Budget is vague or has minor alignment issues with project.	Budget lacks detail or misaligns with project goals.	No response or not relevant.
Milestones & Timeline	Detailed milestones with specific activities and realistic deadlines.	Milestones are clear but could use more specificity or realism.	Milestones are unclear or lack deadlines.	No clear milestones or unrealistic timeline.	No response or not relevant.
Impact	Strong connection to addressing food insecurity or improving food systems.	Addresses food insecurity or systems but lacks depth.	Some relevance to food insecurity but unclear impact.	Weak or no connection to food systems or insecurity.	No response or not relevant.
Coalition Values	Strong commitment to the community and GFC values.	Some commitment to the community and the GFC values but could be stronger.	Some connection to GFC values but lacks strong community commitment.	Weak or unclear commitment to the community or connection to GFC values.	No response or not relevant.