

Spring 2026

Central Okanagan Foundation

Grant Assessment

After reviewing the organization's application, support documents and staff comments, please answer each of the questions below using the following scale:

- 1- Strongly Disagree
- 2- Disagree
- 3- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 4- Agree
- 5- Strongly Agree

Do you have a conflict of interest with this application?*

Choices

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe your conflict.

Character Limit: 1000

Application Name

Name of Project.

Character Limit: 100

Amount recommended*

Character Limit: 20

Does the organization show appropriate collaboration or partnerships?*

Rating Description

- 1 No evidence of collaboration or partnerships.
- 2 Minimal collaboration; partnerships are weak, informal, or not well-established.
- 3 Neutral or unclear; some collaboration exists but is limited or not well defined.
- 4 Good collaboration; partnerships are functional and contribute positively.
- 5 Strong and strategic collaboration; partnerships are well-integrated and impactful.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Is the grant in keeping with the organization's mission, mandate and activities?***Rating Description**

- 1 No alignment; the grant does not relate to the mission, mandate, or activities.
- 2 Weak alignment; some loose connection, but largely outside of core focus areas.
- 3 Neutral or unclear alignment; some relevance but not strongly connected.
- 4 Good alignment; grant supports key aspects of the mission and activities.
- 5 Strong alignment; grant clearly supports the core mission and strategic goals.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Does the proposed request enhance the community?***Rating Description**

- 1 No evident of community benefit; request does not address community needs.
- 2 Minimal enhancement; limited or indirect benefit to the community.
- 3 Neutral or unclear impact; some potential benefit, but not well demonstrated.
- 4 Good enhancement; request supports positive outcomes for the community.
- 5 Strong enhancement; request clearly and significantly benefits the community.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Does the organization support or work with equity deserving groups in a meaningful way?***Rating Description**

- 1 No evidence of support or partnership with equity-deserving groups.
- 2 Minimal support; limited engagement with equity-deserving groups.
- 3 Neutral or unclear; some engagement exists but lacks depth or intentionality.
- 4 Good support; organization partners with or supports equity-deserving groups in a thoughtful way.
- 5 Strong, meaningful engagement; organization prioritizes and actively collaborates with equity-deserving groups in impactful ways.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Do the dates and tasks seem achievable?*

Please only answer for Project Grant Applications

Rating Description

- 1 Not achievable; timeline and tasks are unrealistic or poorly defined.
- 2 Unlikely to be achieved; significant concerns with timing or task load.
- 3 Neutral or uncertain; timeline and tasks may be achievable but lack clarity.
- 4 Mostly achievable; timeline and tasks are generally realistic and well planned.
- 5 Very achievable; timeline and tasks are clear, realistic, and well-structured.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5 or N/A

Does the organization identify the need for the project?*

Rating Description

- 1 No identified need; reason for the project is missing or unsupported.
- 2 Weak justification; need is minimally mentioned with little supporting evidence.
- 3 Neutral or unclear; some need identified but not clearly explained or supported.
- 4 Clear identification; the need is reasonably explained and relevant.
- 5 Strong and well-supported need; clearly demonstrated through data or evidence.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Will the grant benefit residents of the Central Okanagan in a meaningful way?*

Rating Description

- 1 No benefit to Central Okanagan residents is evident.
- 2 Minimal or indirect benefit; limited benefit to the local population.
- 3 Neutral or unclear; some benefit may exist but is not well defined.
- 4 Clear benefit; the grant is likely to positively impact local residents.
- 5 Strong, meaningful benefit; the grant directly addresses community needs and priorities in the Central Okanagan.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Is the grant going to be measured and evaluated effectively?*

Rating Description

- 1 No evaluation plan; no indication of how success will be measured.
- 2 Weak or vague evaluation; limited methods or unclear indicators.
- 3 Neutral or unclear; some evaluation plans mentioned but lacking detail.
- 4 Clear evaluation plan; measurable outcomes and reasonable methods are in place.
- 5 Strong, thorough evaluation; clear metrics, tools, and timelines for assessing impact.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Does the budget reflect a diversity of resources?*

Rating Description

- 1 The budget relies entirely on a single source.
- 2 The budget shows minimal variation in resource types.
- 3 The budget includes some diversity, but it's limited or unclear.
- 4 The budget includes a moderate variety of multiple, clearly different sources.
- 5 The budget is well-balanced with a wide diverse mix of resources.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Does the budget show a reasonable level of expenditure?*

Rating Description:

- 1 No budget is provided, or the information is too incomplete to assess.
- 2 Budget is present but lacks clarity or detail; difficult to determine if spending is reasonable.
- 3 Budget appears generally reasonable, though some items could be better explained or refined.
- 4 Budget is clear and mostly well-justified, with expenditures that align with project goals.
- 5 Budget is thorough, well-organized, and clearly demonstrates thoughtful, appropriate use of funds.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Are the support letters strong?*

Do support letters show:

- formalized partnerships and/or collaboration with other agencies and groups.
- letters from any organization offering the same or similar service indicating how you're meeting needs in the community differently. The letter must describe the value your project/program adds or, how the programs work together to add impact to the community.
- the need within the Central Okanagan community (participants, volunteers or other beneficiaries)

Rating Description:

- 1 No support letters provided, or letters lack relevance and do not address community need, collaboration, or program value.
- 2 Letters are present but weak, limited evidence of partnerships, or impact in the Central Okanagan.
- 3 Letters show some connection to the project, with partial reference to collaboration or community need, but lack depth or specificity.
- 4 Letters demonstrate clear partnerships and provide meaningful insights into community value or alignment with other services.
- 5 Letters are compelling and comprehensive. They highlight formal partnerships, show strong alignment or complementarity with similar services, and clearly demonstrate community need and value.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Is there a plan in place if the request is not fully funded?*

Choices

- Yes
- No

Is the organization in a deficit?

Choices

Yes

No

Deficit Plan

Is the deficit management plan reasonable?*

Choices

Yes

No

Deficit Plan Comments

Character Limit: 1000

Reduced Funding Plan

Is it a reasonable plan?*

Is the plan for how the organization will adapt to reduced funding reasonable?

Rating Description:

- 1 No clear plan is provided, or the approach lacks feasibility.
- 2 Plan is minimal or unclear, with limited detail on how goals will be achieved.
- 3 Plan is somewhat clear and likely achievable, though some elements may need further development.
- 4 Plan is well-structured, realistic, and demonstrates a thoughtful approach to implementation.
- 5 Plan is highly detailed, practical, and demonstrates strong preparedness and clear pathways to success.

Scoring Options: 1 - 5

Comments about reduced funding plan

Character Limit: 1000

Additional Comments

Additional comments about the application

Character Limit: 5000

