

2026 Healthy Communities Delaware - Community Funding (Spring)

Delaware Community Foundation

Evaluation

Project Name

Character Limit: 100

Equity-Focused and Place Based*

Does the proposed work target an HCD-eligible community?

0-Proposed work does not target an HCD-eligible community

4-Proposed work targets an HCD-eligible community

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Vital Conditions*

To what extent will the proposed work advance the vital conditions?

0 = Very Weak.

The project primarily provides short-term crisis relief. It does not address the underlying Vital Conditions.

1 = Weak.

The proposal describes Vital Conditions goals, but the activities are very close to direct services or lack clear logic for how they will improve long-term well-being.

2 = Adequate.

The project clearly targets at least one Vital Condition. It does not dedicate funds for urgent services and focuses on building a sustainable community asset.

3 = Strong.

The project addresses a Vital Condition in a way that creates clear, measurable improvements for a broad group.

4 = Exceptional.

The project addresses multiple Vital Conditions.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Upstream / Community-Level Policy, Systems, & Environmental Change Interventions*

To what extent do the proposed projects aim to change the policies, systems, and environments and create durable improvements for the broader community?

0 = Very Weak.

The project focuses exclusively on individual-level services (downstream). There is no plan for policy, systems, or environmental change in the community.

1 = Weak.

The project is primarily service-delivery, with only vague or minor/unsupported mention of policy, systems, or environmental change. Any proposed change lacks detail.

2 = Adequate.

The project will dedicate resources to a specific PSE change, but the scope is modest, limited to a small sub-group/single organization/site, or primarily involves planning with minor external buy-in. Limited support that the project will lead to lasting change.

3 = Strong.

The project will achieve a significant, high-leverage milestone OR produces a highly rigorous, fully actionable plan with formal institutional or capital buy-in. The resulting change will be durable and designed to impact a significant segment of the broader community (e.g., policy is passed, environmental assets are constructed/secured).

4 = Exemplary.

The project will achieve or set the stage for a fundamental, lasting change that alters policy, systems or environments within the community. The change is explicitly designed for long-term sustainability (e.g., funding will be secured for maintenance, new policy will be integrated into standard operations, environment will be permanently improved and broadly accessible).

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Guided by Community*

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate that the project was identified, prioritized, and developed through a collaborative process with residents and partners?

0 = Very Weak.

No evidence of community input. The project appears to be designed in isolation by a single organization.

1 = Weak.

The community was "informed" rather than consulted. Vague or generic mention of community needs without specific documentation of how they were identified.

2 = Adequate.

Basic alignment. The project identifies a general connection to an existing plan OR provides evidence of a specific process (e.g., a survey or meeting) where the community reacted to a pre-set idea.

3 = Strong.

Collaborative Approach. Residents and partners were actively involved in deciding the priority of the project. The proposal provides specific evidence such as:

- Direct citations and alignment with a recognized Community Revitalization or Comprehensive Plan.
 - A clear scope of work focused on creating a collaborative structure or formal planning activities.
 - Summaries of resident/partner input (e.g., meeting minutes) used to prioritize the project.
- 4 = Exemplary.**

Community-Led / Co-Created. The project was initiated or heavily shaped by the community from the start. It is explicitly identified as a top priority in an existing plan OR the proposal demonstrates a deep, documented co-design process that includes diverse or underrepresented voices.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Continuous Engagement with and Accountability to Community*

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a plan for continuous involvement, transparency, and accountability to residents and partners throughout the grant period?

0 = Very Weak.

No plan provided. There is no mention of how the community will be involved during implementation or how progress will be reported.

1 = Weak.

One-way communication. Residents and partners will be informed (e.g., social media posts, newsletters) rather than engaged. Accountability is vague or internal-only.

2 = Adequate.

Consistent feedback loops. Includes a clear schedule (e.g., quarterly meetings) for updates and feedback. Outlines a basic plan for reporting outcomes to the community/partners.

3 = Strong.

Active partnership. Residents/partners have defined roles in implementation (e.g., a steering committee). Reporting is frequent, transparent, and specifically tailored to be accessible to the community.

4 = Exemplary.

Shared power. The community has formal oversight or decision-making authority over project adjustments. High transparency (e.g., public dashboards, community-led evaluations).

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Logic*

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a clear and logical connection among the identified needs, proposed activities, expected outputs, and desired outcomes?

0 = Very Weak.

No clear or logical connection between needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes.

1 = Weak.

Weak connection among needs activities, outputs, and outcomes with inconsistencies or gaps in the logic.

2 = Adequate.

Adequate connection among needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes with minor inconsistencies.

3 = Strong.

Strong connection among needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes with clear and logical flow.

4 = Exceptional.

Exceptional connection among needs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, demonstrating a robust and well-reasoned project plan.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Evidence*

To what extent does the proposal provide evidence for the proposed intervention(s)?

0 = Very Weak.

No evidence or rationale provided to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s).

Any evidence/rationale provided is irrelevant, unreliable, or insufficient.

1 = Weak.

Limited evidence or rationale is provided to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). The evidence/rationale is weak, unconvincing, or not directly relevant to the proposed solution.

2 = Adequate.

Some relevant evidence is provided to support the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s).

The evidence may be adequate but could be strengthened.

3 = Strong.

Strong evidence from credible sources (research, pilot studies, successful projects) supports the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s). The rationale is well-reasoned, persuasive, and logically sound.

4 = Exemplary.

Very strong evidence from rigorous research, multiple successful pilot studies, or similar large scale successful projects supports the effectiveness of the proposed solution(s).

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Project Readiness/Organizational Capacity*

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate the necessary team, advanced preparation, and financial resources to successfully execute the project within a 12-month timeframe?

0 = Very Weak.

High Risk. The proposal does not address readiness or capacity or shows major gaps (e.g., no team, no pre-work started, or no plan for risks). Completion within 12 months is unlikely.

1 = Weak.

Low Confidence. The proposal lacks details about the team/expertise needed, advanced preparation, and resources. Significant hurdles (e.g. permits, MOUs, etc.) are unaddressed.

2 = Adequate.

Capable. Basic Readiness. The team is identified, and past work is relevant. Key pre-work (e.g., permits/MOUs, etc.) is in progress but not finalized. Financial resources are likely, and a basic risk plan exists.

3 = Strong.

High Confidence. Most pre-work (e.g., draft MOUs, internal approvals, etc.) is completed. The team is skilled and ready to start immediately. Full funding is confirmed, and the risk mitigation plan is specific and realistic.

4 = Exemplary.

"Shovel-Ready." All essential pre-work (e.g., signed MOUs, secured permits, etc.) is finished. The team has a high level of dedicated expertise and is ready to start immediately. Financial resources are in place. Risks are thoroughly analyzed with clear "Plan B" strategies.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Budget and Fiscal Stewardship*

To what extent does the budget provide a clear, reasonable, and allowable financial plan that aligns directly with the project's activities and goals?

0 = Inadequate.

The budget is missing or incoherent. Includes significant ineligible expenses. Doesn't align with the project narrative.

1 = Weak.

The budget provides high-level figures but lacks the detail needed to understand specific spending. Includes ineligible or questionable expenses.

2 = Adequate.

The budget generally aligns with the Action Plan. Costs are appropriate for the activities. Most expenses appear allowable, though some line items may need minor adjustments to meet guidelines. It provides enough detail for a reviewer to understand how the money will be spent.

3 = Strong.

There is a clear, line-item connection between every activity and its cost. Expenses are eligible and reasonable.

4 = Exemplary.

The budget is highly cost-effective and demonstrates high fiscal stewardship. All expenses are eligible, reasonable, aligned with the action plan, and justified.

Scoring Options: 0 - 4

Notes

Character Limit: 500

Do you recommend this proposal for HCD funding?***Choices**

Do not recommend

Recommend with modifications

Recommend as is

Notes

Character Limit: 500