

UMANO GRANT ASSESSMENT MATRIX

At Umano, we believe that grassroots initiatives can be the source of groundbreaking ideas that can be most in need of funding or support. We provide grant funding to individuals and organizations worldwide who effectively engage their community in building empathy.

Name of Applicant:

Project:

Organization:

Country:

Name of Assessor:

Date:

We recognize that English is a second language for most of our applicants.

(Shaded areas are mandatory criteria.)

	The project / proposal	Yes	No
1.	Advances the welfare of humans, animals and/or the environment		
2.	Promotes empathy and inspires behavioral and social change		
3.	Engages in effective outreach of the mission		
4.	Seeks to inspire and build empathy and compassion in others		
5.	Is well thought out, relevant, and meaningful		
6.	Has a results-oriented proposal which is measurable (including conceptually)		
7.	Impact can be quantified and reported, there is a clear reporting mechanism which can be assessed		
8.	Can be scaled, replicated, and/or cross-pollinated with other initiatives		
9.	Has the capacity to provide transparency on the funded program		
10.	Meet the priority objectives of reducing human suffering and/or promoting well-being, preserving the environment and climate regeneration, protecting wildlife and animal liberation		
11.	Supports diversity, equity and inclusion (if applicable)		
12.	New organization/initiative with high potential		

13.	Applicant can be a positive ambassador of empathy by sharing their story to motivate others to action		
14.	Is an established program by a large, well-funded organization		
15.	Is focused on or related in any way to political, national, or religious advocacy		
	Notes:		

Grants Assessment Matrix

Please place score in percentage.

	Score Criteria	Score Criteria Weighting
1.	<p>Project Alignment</p> <p>The proposed project clearly articulates benefits and defined beneficiaries. It communicates the importance and relevance of the issue and the strength of the idea. This might include the number and range of beneficiary, the degree of benefit, the vulnerability of the target group, any deprivation and/or inequality factors. It may also include a range of outcomes or outputs, or other means of measurement. The proposed project aligns with at least one of our priority objectives of advancing the welfare of humans, animals, or the environment. It should ideally take all three priorities into account. Please assign 5% extra to the total of the 30% weight for projects that endeavor to address all three priority streams.</p>	/30%
2.	<p>Evidence of Need, Measurable Impact and Clear Reporting Mechanism</p>	/25%

	The project has been devised on evidence of a clear and quantified need or demand. An appropriate evaluation mechanism is outlined. If the project sought a range of benefits, the measurement of success is indicated. Impact assessment is appropriate to the specific project proposed.	
3.	Scalability and Repeatability The proposed project can be scaled to increase impact and be replicated in other communities. Has this potential been communicated clearly.	/10%
4.	Sustainable Benefits / Sustainability There is evidence of how the learning or benefits will be sustained among beneficiaries, and also whether future funding consequences have been considered – if there is an exit strategy, or a plan for funding the project / staff member after the grant has ended. Is the organization considering sustaining operations beyond this proposal.	/10%
5.	Project Costs Are the costs of the project reasonable, are management costs or overheads high, are evaluation costs included and clearly outlined by line item. What other funding has been sourced, if any. Worth considering: how reliant the applicant is on the success of this application, in isolation.	/10%
6.	Building Empathy There is clear evidence of how the project will build empathy. At times abstract, the applicant strongly portrays how they will promote the concept of empathy and inspire behavioral and/or social change.	/10%
7.	Organization Evidence is presented that the organization is properly governed, accounts / decision making / regulatory bodies / reputation / affiliate or partner organizations. The applicant evokes confidence in their ability to execute the proposal.	/5%
	Total Score:	/100%

Response Range

Score	Answers
Zero	Unacceptable response:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none provided • demonstrating a significant misunderstanding of the question • not meeting the criteria even to a minimum extent
Low	<p>Inadequate response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meeting little aspects of the criteria to a minimum extent but fails in others • inadequate evidence of ability to meet or deliver to the proposed criteria
Low Mid	<p>Weak response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meeting certain aspects to a minimum extent but fails in others • little evidence of ability to meet or deliver to the proposed criteria
High Mid	<p>Fair response as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meeting the majority but not all aspects of the criteria • adequate evidence of ability to meet or deliver to the proposed criteria
High	<p>Good response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meeting all aspects of the criteria • comprehensive, clear proposal demonstrating a good understanding of the criteria • clear evidence of ability to meet or deliver to the proposed criteria
Full Marks	<p>Response which exceeds criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • materially exceeding the criteria, through a creative or innovative response or where additional 'added value' areas have been identified • clear evidence of ability to exceed the proposed criteria