

5/15/2017				
Draft Rubric: Grantmaker and Nonprofit Relationship for creating community impact				
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