

Draft Rubric: Grantmaker and Nonprofit Relationship for creating community impact				
5/15/2017				
Rating Criteria	1 "Transactional"	2 "Engaged"	3 "Partners"	4 "Transformative"
Alignment (belief)	relationship is tied only to the term of the grant Considered a "once and done" engagement. Outcome delivery time not considered shared goals are output related and/or short-term outcomes Own organization's goals are priority over relationship	Parties collaborate for the term of the grant Understand the time it takes to achieve the outcome outputs align with grant goals recognize goals as shared goals	Relationship is more than the terms of the grant Able to discuss long-term implications of outcomes and resources required organization leaders are focused on shared goals/outcomes vs their own organization both able to explain each other's motivation for engaging	Work together transcends any promise of funding Partnership is top of mind, with both organizations sharing their impact with others Organizational priorities are aligned to advance the community Shared beliefs in the highest potential outcomes, goals, strategies, measurement
Mutuality (feeling)	not expecting to work together in the future power dynamics are more funder-driven one-sided interest in outcome or output achievement	Recognize that working together is mutually beneficial nonprofit has some input in shaping funding relationship funder interested in nonprofit achievement in outcome	proven track record of previous successes in partnership/ collaboration nonprofit able to shape initiatives along with the funder Halo effect - funder recognizes organization's achievements benefit both brands both engaged in the outcomes	Boards of each organization are committed to the relationship; sustaining the relationship nonprofit and grantmaker leverage their collective influence to advance community outcomes both holistically engaged to achieve outcome Each organization makes it a priority to invest resources (proportional)
Trust/Transparency (what ones says)	each party is waiting to "see" if commitments are fulfilled little transparency or trust/ careful and defensive about results	Commitments were filled in the past, setting expectations about future results Some transparency; beginning to share some information that could inform result expectations Learning that it is ok to be vulnerable to the other	-trust is present with leader commitment from both organizations willing to take the risk to be more transparent on the bad as well as the good Partial internal and external transparency with each other Evaluate progress together with joint problem-solving	succession planning in place to sustain the relationship Nonprofit is operating at "accreditation level" transparency, ethics & accountability full disclosure and transparency Seek each other out to make things happen
Communication (how it is said)	no feedback communication specific only to grant application and acknowledgement process no additional feedback or communication outside of grant	feedback is limited to terms of the grant online email contact vs personal connection on each other's email lists	occasional call to inform of good news or progress with minor bumps in the road shared meet regularly to discuss deeper levels of issues and challenges communication content is more specific in detail Work together to convince community of outcome	Ongoing "formative" feedback on progress Share the good/bad/ugly of the initiative & relationship Communicate across the organization - leader-board-staff and across the community Brands are connected to the initiative