



| Category | Score |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Focus | /5 |
| Potential for Impact | /5 |
| Organizational Readiness | /5 |
| Overall Impression | /5 |
| Total | /20 |

| Focus | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the applicant and the submitted proposal in alignment with the stated goals and approach of The Ascend Fund? • Is the proposal designed to significantly increase the number of women serving in state legislatures in one of the targeted states? • Does the application throw out preconceived notions of what political leadership looks like and find new strategies to identify women from a wide variety of backgrounds, especially those from under-represented communities, and enhance their ability to reach elected office? • Does the proposed strategy focus on training, recruiting, and empowering a diverse field of women candidates and removing barriers to women running for office and winning? | | | | |
| 0-1 | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 |
| Proposal fails to identify how it will expand the pathway for more women to run and win. | Activities outlined in proposal only loosely connected to effort to increase women's representation. | Proposal identifies need to transform the system but is focused only on the current election cycle. | Clear understanding of need to build political pathway, with strategy to do so. | Articulates advanced strategy for building a robust and durable political pathway for women to achieve political parity. |
| Proposal lacks focus on women and/or political engagement. | Proposal generally focuses on women's political engagement. | Proposal broadly focuses on women running for office. | Proposal specifically focuses on women running for the state legislature. | Proposal specifically addresses women running for the state legislature with demonstrated understanding of district targeting. |
| Proposal will not benefit a diverse population of women. | Proposal may benefit some women from under-represented communities, but not be design. | Proposal is proactively designed to identify women from a wide variety of backgrounds, but strategies are underdeveloped. | Proposal will consistently benefit a diverse population of women and prioritizes those from under-represented communities. | Proposal designed around effectively electing diverse populations with specific focus on women from under-represented communities. |
| Proposal fails to demonstrate understanding of barriers women face or how to dismantle. | Proposal reveals limited understanding of barriers women face but fails to connect to larger strategy. | Proposal shows basic understanding of barriers women face and presents straightforward approach to address. | Proposal demonstrates understanding of barriers women face and connects to effective mitigation strategies. | Proposal indicates sophisticated understanding of barriers unique to specific populations and provides evidence in support of |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | highly tactical mitigation strategies. |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Comments:

| Potential for Impact | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposal present an innovative, but feasible, solution to the challenge of getting more women to run for office? • Does the proposal have strong potential to accelerate progress towards parity in the short-term (this election cycle) and over the long-term (next 30 years) and achieve lasting, positive change? • Is the project replicable with an efficient ability to expand the scale and scope of the work in future years? | | | | |
| 0-1 | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 |
| Proposal replicates what is currently being done with no changes. | Proposal replicates what is currently being done with minimal adaptations. | Proposal describes promising new adaptation to an existing approach. | Proposal describes creative ideas and vision for success. | Proposal presents innovative idea with clear vision for success. |
| Lacks implementation plan and unrealistic plan to scale. | Easy to implement because already being done, lacks plan to scale appropriately within time frame. | Ability to begin implementation during grant period, may struggle to scale over time. | Able to initiate proposal within grant period and scale over time. | Feasible to implement proposal in 12-15 months and scale over time. |
| Rate of change unlikely to increase beyond current trajectory. May struggle to sustain positive gains years over year. | Nominal improvement to rate of change. May struggle to sustain positive gains years over year. | Plan will accelerate pace of change towards parity but may not achieve targets and/or gains may not be sustained. | Plan will make significant progress towards parity within targeted time frame with demonstrated ability to sustain gains. | Realistic plan to achieve parity within targeted time frame or before in coupled with strategy to sustain gains. |
| Model is unique to location or organization and could not be replicated. | Model would require significant alternations to replicate. | Some aspects of model could be replicated elsewhere. | Most aspects of model could be replicated with moderate modifications. | Model could be easily replicated elsewhere. |
| Unlikely project could grow in either scale or scope in future. | Project could expand in scale or scope, but not both. | Limited expansion of scale and scope possible but could face significant challenges. | Expansion of scale and scope achievable with limited adjustments necessary. | Project could easily expand in scale or scope in future years. |
| Comments: | | | | |

Organizational Readiness

- Does the organization have the leadership and staff with the skills and experience to implement the proposed solution?
- Is the leadership reflective of the targeted population and community broadly?
- Does the organization demonstrate a clear understanding and appreciation of the importance of an intersectional approach and diversity, equity, and inclusion in the work to elect women?
- Does the organization have the financial capacity to absorb the funding and are the project plan achievable and realistic within the available budget?
- Does the proposal provide evidence of past success in similar projects and in building collaborative ventures? Does the organization exhibit a willingness to partner with other diverse organizations in the future?

| 0-1 | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Lack of formal leadership and staff structure; | Loosely connected team with little to no relevant experience. | Loosely connected team with some experience in space. | Team comprised of accomplished professionals with relevant experience. | Led by an experienced team of qualified experts with deep direct experience. |
| Applicant has no experience working in political sphere. | Applicant has some experience working in political sphere. | Applicant has experience training and recruiting candidates to run for office. | Applicant has experience training and recruiting women to run for office with record of success. | Applicant has deep experience training and recruiting women to run for office with record of significant success at the state legislative level. |
| Leadership lacks diversity and is disconnected from population. | Leadership has limited diversity, but some connected to the targeted population. | Leadership credibly represents community being served. | Leadership is diverse with history of engaging with the targeted populations. | Leadership reflective of community and knowledgeable and passionately engaged with targeted population. |
| No reference to DEI or lacks clear understanding of work. | Limited understanding of DEI and little incorporation into work. | Stated importance of DEI and incorporated into project plan. | Elements of DEI incorporated into organization and connected to work and project plan. | Well-articulated understanding of DEI and clearly integrated into organization and work broadly, but also highlighted in project plan. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Insufficient financial capacity. | Project represents significant growth, potentially stretching organization's financial capacity. | Adequate financial capacity to execute project plan. | Good financial capacity with some flexibility to execute project plan. Could explore additional resources. | Flexible and robust financial capacity with ability to leverage additional internal and external resources. |
| Plan unrealistic and/or unachievable. | Plan unlikely to achieve all results. | Plan is cost effective and likely to achieve results. | Plan is both achievable and realistic and builds in contingencies. | Plan is both achievable and realistic, builds in contingencies, and demonstrates learnings from past experiences. |
| No evidence of past success or experience in collaborative ventures. | Limited evidence of past project success and some experience working in collaboration with other organizations. | Evidence of past successes working with other organizations on a small scale. No or limited experience building or leading coalitions. | Track record of programmatic success and strong experience participating in coalitions, with more limited experience building or leading coalitions. | Remarkable record of achieving programmatic goals and deep experience building, leading, and participating in diverse coalitions. |
| Comments: | | | | |

| Overall Impression | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| O-1 | 1-2 | 2-3 | 3-4 | 4-5 |
| Comments: | | | | |