

2026 Rubric for DAC Mini Grants: Application Scoring

Please complete one form for each application you have been assigned to score.

With questions, please contact Monique Johnson (monique@dacac.org).

✗ Required

1. Name of reviewer (your name): *

2. Number of application you are reviewing (application ID): *

Select your answer



3. Our mission is as follows: "Our purpose is to provide an effective network to collaboratively prevent substance abuse, primarily by youth, and to reduce the negative impact of alcohol and other drugs in the Allen County community.'

How well does this project/program align with our mission?

(1 being not at all aligned and 10 being exactly aligned.) *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

4. How clear is the plan for program or project implementation? *

- Plan for implementation is not included in this application.
- Plan for implementation is general/unspecific; plan is impractical or illogical.
- Some clarification is needed, but plan is clear and logical.
- Staff/personnel have clearly defined roles and the plan for implementation is thorough. No clarification needed.

5. Is this program/project evidence-based? *

- This application includes approaches which have been proven to be ineffective, harmful, or are outdated; or does not provide clear information about whether or not it is evidence-based.
- This application is supported by peer-reviews.
- This application is evidence-informed.
- This application is evidence-based.

6. What is the projected reach of the project or program outlined in the application? *

7. What funding amount is being requested? (In USD/\$.) *

8. Please refer to the completed budget excel sheet: *

- The line items are reasonable and expenses are detailed.
- The budget needs adjustments OR expenses are vague.
- The budget does not reflect responsible stewardship of resources.
- The budget is incomplete or does not make mathematical sense.

9. Please rate the projected reach vs. cost of this program/project. *

- Reach vs. cost is unreasonable or unsatisfactory.
- Reach vs. cost needs improvement.
- Reach vs. cost is reasonable/acceptable.
- Reach vs. cost is exceptional.

10. Please rate the community collaboration of this program/project: *

- Role of external partners and deliverables not identified; commitment is weak or non-existent.
- Support from external partners exists but is weak or poorly defined; significant clarification and/or commitment needed.
- Support from external partners exists; some clarification of roles or commitment of resources needs to occur.
- Strong commitment exists from external partners; deliverables from external partners and roles are clearly identified.

11. SMART outcomes are (1) specific, (2) measurable, (3) achievable, (4) relevant, and (5) time-bound. Please rate the stated goals and programmatic evaluation plans: *

- Neither stated outcomes nor a plan for programmatic evaluation were listed / neither meet any SMART requirements.
- Stated outcomes and programmatic evaluation plans do not meet most SMART requirements.
- Stated outcomes and programmatic evaluation plans meet most SMART requirements and could easily be adjusted to meet all requirements.

12. How many categories of marginalized populations does this organization serve? *

(How many "items" are listed in the final section of the blinded application?)

- 0-4
- 5-9
- 10-14
- 15+

13. Any comments?