



CASE STUDY

INPUT WITH IMPACT: A CASE STUDY ON EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE FOOD WASTE GRANT-MAKING IN DENVER AND BALTIMORE

Over the past two years, with continued support from The Rockefeller Foundation, the NRDC Food Matters project has worked with the cities of Denver and Baltimore to develop and implement strategies to drive dramatic, innovative, and system-wide food waste reduction.

In each city, NRDC first worked with local partners to complete two landscape assessments—one on food scrap recycling and one on food rescue—to understand the unique conditions in each city and make tailored, actionable recommendations. NRDC then worked extensively with city teams to create multiple-year work plans based on recommendations from the landscape assessments and on goals set out in various city plans. For example, in Denver, the work plan drew from the Denver Food Vision and Denver Food Action Plan, which serve as the guiding principles behind the city's goals associated with community engagement, food access, and food waste reduction.

This work has made it clear that reducing food waste and, even more than that, achieving comprehensive food system change cannot be done without widespread community support. Local partners are key to reaching any city's goals on food waste reduction. For that reason, NRDC worked with Denver and Baltimore to establish an equitable food waste grant-making program that would support organizations that have been doing this work in their communities and have the local knowledge and expertise needed to make these initiatives successful. Working from insight gained in the landscape assessments, community engagement and expertise, city staff input, and the Food Matters city work plans, the NRDC Food Matters project began a request for proposals (RFP) process to grant \$200,000 in funding to local groups and partners in each city working on food scrap recycling and food waste reduction.

AN EQUITY-CENTERED FRAMEWORK

NRDC is unequivocally committed to the advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in its own work and within the environmental movement as a whole. The Food Matters team seeks to ensure that all of its work and processes build and maintain local buy-in, participation, and connection to work already happening within communities. Consequently, a critical element of the Food Matters RFP project was a commitment to equitable, transparent, and mutually beneficial partnerships with local groups in each city. When given the opportunity to grant funding through the Food Matters project, the NRDC team recognized that traditional grant-making processes tend to favor larger organizations that are already well staffed and experienced in the rules and culture of fundraising. Therefore, when designing the grant-making process the Food Matters team decided to be intentional about leveraging NRDC's commitment to equity, hiring outside equity design consultants to ensure accountability.

DESIGNING WITH, NOT FOR

While many organizations and coalitions desire more equitable and inclusive processes, most aren't sure how and when to include various levels of staff and community members. This is especially true when there are competing needs or priorities among individuals and programs. Often those with less power are left out of these processes altogether. This results in policies and initiatives that lack

buy-in and trust from internal and external stakeholders, usually creating or exacerbating tension in leadership and harming group morale. To avoid this, the Food Matters team launched its equity-centered RFP process by bringing on equity consultants at [Weav Studio](#) to project manage, provide strategic insight, and develop an accessible application process. Weav prioritizes inclusive, human-centered design, operating under the principle that the people closest to a problem are the best equipped with the knowledge and experience to design solutions.

Weav Studio's goal was to use cross-sector collaboration to collectively design the entire grant process. The foundation of the project plan for the RFP process involved working closely with local partners in Denver and Baltimore to recruit individuals from organizations likely to apply to the RFP itself. In this way, the funding areas, award size, and application process would be designed *with* potential applicants and not just *for* them.

DESIGNING IN DENVER

Offering grants through an equity-centered RFP process was new for the NRDC Food Matters team. Given this, the team decided to stagger the RFP timelines and processes for Denver and Baltimore. What was learned in Denver would inform our work in Baltimore.

Early on, the NRDC Food Matters team recognized that running a highly participatory design process could face low turnout given that many of the local organizations that we invited were heavily reliant on volunteers. At a roundtable event held to present findings from the initial local landscape assessments, members of the team surveyed attendees (representatives of the local organizations) to assess their desire to participate in the collaborate design process and their capacity to do so. A majority of the survey respondents indicated that they would definitely want to be involved and estimated the amount of participation they could offer (e.g., interviews, half-day design session, full-day design session).

In November 2018, working from the participation feedback from survey respondents, the NRDC Food Matters team with Weav Studio held the first all-day design and ideation session with representatives of organizations that would be applying for funding in Denver. In this and subsequent design sessions, participants included stakeholders from local advocacy groups, last-mile food rescue organizations, food banks, neighborhood organizations, community gardens, urban farms, churches, and community resource centers.

Starting off, participants were divided into groups based on goals informed by the Denver [Food Action Plan](#) set out by the Denver Department of Public Health and Environment (DDPHE) and recommendations from the previously completed landscape assessments. With facilitation, each group identified the barriers that stood in the way of local partners' achieving the defined goals and brainstormed possible community-driven solutions to address these barriers. Groups were then asked to estimate the amount of



funding it would take to make progress on these proposed solutions over a six- to eight-month period. On average, groups felt that \$10,000 would be an appropriate and meaningful grant.

In the second half of the session, new groups were formed on the basis of experience with the grant application process. Each group had at least one person who had sought a grant before and one person who was new to or less familiar with the process. Using a human-centered design activity called journey mapping, groups plotted an entire grant application process from identifying the funding opportunity to receiving notification of an award. From the map, each group identified frequent points of confusion for applicants along the way, then developed solutions to reduce these moments and increase accessibility throughout the journey. Finally, the full group created a map of distribution channels that the RFP announcement should go through in order to reach the largest number of potential applicants.

Findings from the design session were illuminating but not surprising. Participants identified many community-driven organizations and programs already working in Denver toward the Food Action Plan goals. They felt that funding existing organizations that were experiencing capacity funding gaps would result in greater benefits than supporting the kind of “new” and “innovative” solutions that are often more appealing to funders. The groups also determined that a short, concise grant application would remove barriers related to the amount of time and experience needed to complete a more traditional, lengthy application, which might ask for resumes of all staff, longer narratives, a list of board members, and so on.

DEVELOPING THE DENVER CRITERIA

From the insight gained in the design sessions, Weav and the NRDC Food Matters team developed selection criteria for applications. Feedback from design session participants indicated it was important that eligibility be broad in order to increase the outreach of the RFP. Accordingly, we decided the RFP would be open to any nonprofit or social-enterprise small business working in one of the three focus areas. The final criteria categories were these:

Focus Area of Applicant's Work (40 percent of total weight).

Applicants were asked to describe how their current work or proposed project would support one or more of the following areas related to Denver's Food Action Plan. (To avoid a bias toward organizations with larger capacities, applying across more than one focus area would not increase the overall score or strength of the application.)

Food waste prevention: efforts to reduce or eliminate excess food at the source, including improved inventory management, repurposing of surplus, and alternatives to the underlying causes of food going to waste.

Food rescue: efforts to maintain or expand donation of nutritious foods, make rescued foods more accessible in the most underserved neighborhoods and to people with disabilities, and strengthen the operational efficiency and responsiveness of the food rescue system.

Food scrap recycling: efforts to expand or improve composting and/or anaerobic digestion processing or collection infrastructure, including education and recruitment targeting food scrap generators.

Demonstrated Need (30 percent). Applicants had to indicate how grant funding would close operational funding gaps or alleviate project-funding needs. This was in direct response to the request from participants in the design session to direct funding toward organizations that were in the greatest immediate need of capacity funding.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion-Centered Values (30 percent). It was important for the NRDC Food Matters team to select applicants that shared equity-centered values. At the same time, we recognized that organizations with the capacity to develop DEI initiatives were usually larger and already well resourced. In order to not bias this score toward well-resourced organizations, the team decided to create three categories for evaluating the DEI criterion. The first considered stated DEI values of the applicant organization. The second looked at how well the community members served were represented demographically by the staff and services of the organization. The third category focused on the geographic location of the neighborhoods assisted by the organization. Specifically, higher scores would go to groups serving the six historically underserved Denver neighborhoods identified in the Denver Food Action Plan.

Finally, it was expected that a handful of small businesses would be eligible and apply for funding. Those able to provide proof that they were a minority- and/or women-owned business enterprise (MWBE) would receive a 20 percent increase in their overall DEI score.

From the selection criteria, the team then developed a scoring rubric and matrix that would help the selection committee fairly score all applicants. Moreover, to ensure transparency of the grant-making process, the scoring rubric was made public so all applicants would be informed of how application questions would be scored and weighed as they put together their proposals. The Denver scoring criteria and matrix can be found at the end of this document.

BUILDING THE DENVER APPLICATION

Using feedback from the design session, the team knew it needed to develop an application that would not be cumbersome to smaller-staffed or volunteer-managed organizations, often the very groups in the most need of capacity grant money. The team made a best-guess estimate of the type and number of questions that were needed to accurately and meaningfully assess applicants within the scoring rubric. Questions asking for basic information were limited in scope, and those requiring a narrative response were minimal and limited to 500-word answers. For example, the application did not ask for a financial sustainability plan, given the feedback that these questions can bar smaller organizations from applying for certain grants.

Drawing on other insights from the design session, the team decided on an easy-to-use, website-based application and a downloadable Microsoft Word document to assist applicants through the process. This package included detailed information on the purpose of funding; deadlines, scoring, and eligibility; what to expect if selected; and an appendix providing the scoring rubric and the local landscape assessments.

LAUNCHING THE DENVER APPLICATION

Using the crowdsourced list of communication channels from the design session alongside extensive research by the NRDC and City team, the local Denver NRDC team member was able to distribute the application to a wide network of organizations. Since the design session involved potential candidates, many organizations were already prepared for the application process.

The application period was five weeks, and throughout that time, NRDC team members responded within 24 hours to questions submitted on the website by potential applicants. Community partners told the team that the collaborative design process for the application was highly appreciated and increased their confidence in completing the application. In total, 37 groups applied, representing a diverse range of organizations throughout the City and County of Denver.

DENVER SELECTION PROCESS

The formation of the selection committee was as important as designing the application itself. To balance place-based and subject matter expertise, the selection committee consisted of the NRDC Food Matters team, including one team member with extensive Denver knowledge, plus two Denver community representatives and a DDPHE staff member representing the city.

In the first round of scoring, half of the NRDC Food Matters staff along with the city and organizational partners scored each application on the basis of the scoring rubric. In cases where scores for an applicant varied widely, the committee walked through the application, discussed the logic behind each person's scoring, and then came to a consensus over

“Our entire organization was impacted by this grant. We have grown in the number of people that are contributing to our work, [and] we have expanded the number of partnerships that we are involved with by threefold, which has strengthened our support network. We have also used these funds to support the innovation work of a potential fundraising source through repurposing the plastic cutlery harvested from our waste sort-line.” —Consumption Literacy Project

a new score for the application. They then had a robust conversation to select the top 18 applications to send to the final round of scoring.

For this round, the top 18 submissions were evaluated by two team members who had not participated in the first round of scoring. As in the first round, applications with high score variance were flagged for discussion. The Denver-based NRDC team member, who had participated in the first round of scoring, joined the final selection conversation and provided critical insight into the local landscape and the first round committee’s thinking. After discussion and some rescoreing, the group selected 10 organizations to receive \$10,000 each.

REPORTING IN DENVER

Through the design process, we heard from participants that reporting requirements for most grants were cumbersome and took up valuable staff time and resources. In response, the team decided on simple and straightforward reporting requirements, with reports to be submitted by email at the end of the grant period. Recipients were expected to answer the following questions in no more than 200 words each:

1. How did you use these funds?
2. What impact do you think these funds had?
3. How did your use of these funds influence future program or organizational planning, if at all?
4. If you collected metrics throughout this grant period, what were they and what do they show?

Optional additional questions were included in the reporting template. These gave grantees an additional opportunity to provide feedback on the application process and the impact of the grant.

DESIGNING IN BALTIMORE

On the heels of announcing the Denver grant awardees, the team quickly turned to launching the program in Baltimore. While many lessons learned in Denver were applicable in Baltimore, it was important that the design process reflect key differences between the two cities, such as different demographics and level of need among local groups. Additionally, the City of Baltimore’s plan to increase food rescue and reduce food waste, outlined in the [Baltimore Food Waste and Recovery Strategy](#), differed significantly from Denver’s. Finally, in Denver a local NRDC team member was there to provide local knowledge and facilitate relationships. In Baltimore this role was filled by a City of Baltimore employee whose salary was funded through the Food Matters project. This meant that the city would be more meaningfully involved in the design process than was the case in Denver.

As in Denver, consultants from Weav first held a design session with a similar mix of local advocacy organizations, last-mile food rescue groups, food banks, neighborhood organizations, community gardens, urban farms, churches, and community resource centers. During the session, the groups worked from goals established in the City of Baltimore’s Food Waste and Recovery Strategy and from landscape assessments conducted by the Food Matters Baltimore team. The groups completed the same grant application process journey map and similarly created a crowdsourced list of distribution channels.

Insight and information from the Baltimore design session differed from Denver’s in a few ways. First, groups identified schools as important potential grant recipients because they could teach students about food waste reduction and encourage them to continue these practices throughout their lives. Also, since the majority of neighborhoods in Baltimore would benefit from increasing the capacity of the organizations that serve them, geographic or neighborhood need was not identified as a significant area to focus on.

As in the Denver design sessions, Baltimore organizations said that funding should be prioritized for organizations with the most immediate capacity needs. Additionally, they requested a grant application process with the lowest possible barriers to entry, with minimal narrative questions and reporting requirements.

CRITERIA IN BALTIMORE

Weav redesigned the selection criteria and rubric to integrate insights from the Baltimore design session, especially in regard to focus areas and diversity, equity, and inclusion criteria. Weav also incorporated feedback from the Denver selection committee. The Baltimore criteria were broken down in the following way:

Focus Area of Applicant's Work (40 percent of total weight).

Applicants had to describe how their current work or proposed project would support Baltimore's goal of reducing commercial food waste by 50 percent by 2030 and residential food waste by 80 percent by 2040. Priority was given to groups advancing food waste prevention, food rescue, and/or food scrap recycling, through activities such as:

- Starting or expanding food waste prevention efforts, including food waste awareness and education.
- Maintaining, expanding, or improving food rescue operations or capacity. This includes, but is not limited to:
 - Expanding donation of nutritious foods
 - Making rescued foods more accessible in the most underserved neighborhoods and/or to people with disabilities
- Expanding or improving existing composting operations to increase their capacity to process food scraps.
- Establishing a community composting location to increase access to composting services.

- Developing or implementing a composting training program for city residents.
- Using food waste prevention, food rescue, or food scrap recycling to invest in the community, create jobs, or otherwise address root causes of food insecurity.

Demonstrated Need (30 percent). Applicants had to indicate how grant funding would close operational funding gaps or alleviate project-funding needs.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion-Centered Values (30 percent). This area was informed directly by the Baltimore Office of Sustainability's Guidance for Equitable Implementation. Participants were asked to describe how their work or organization actively addressed racial and economic inequity in Baltimore in any or all of the following ways:

- Proposed project does not generate burdens, either directly or indirectly, for groups whose life outcomes are disproportionately affected by structures in society.
- Services are accessible to households, organizations, and businesses throughout the community—particularly those that are run by and for historically underrepresented communities.
- Organization/company/group supports historically underrepresented communities through workforce development, living wage jobs, and small-business or contracting opportunities.

Applicants were also asked to describe how well community members served were represented demographically by the staff and services of the organization.

Finally, as in Denver, it was expected that a handful of small businesses would be eligible and apply for funding. Again, those able to prove that they were a minority- and/or women-owned business enterprise would receive a 20 percent increase in their overall DEI score.

The Baltimore scoring criteria and matrix can be found at the end of this document.



© Whitelock Community Farm

“We are very grateful to have received this grant at a time of great need . . . It is up to community organizations like ours to learn from experience and to develop our own strategies that are unique to the communities we serve and to the challenges we face in our service. I applaud the Food Matters project for invigorating grassroots organizations like ours.” —Baltimore Food Rescue

BUILDING AND LAUNCHING THE BALTIMORE APPLICATION

Utilizing feedback from applicants in the Denver process and the NRDC team, Weav integrated small functionality changes to the application and updated question content areas where necessary. The application information package was updated with the Baltimore scoring rubric and landscape assessments.

As in Denver, the launch of the Baltimore application went smoothly with no reported issues. The application was widely distributed by local partners and organizations that had attended the design session. Numerous design session participants and applicants told the team that they appreciated the grantmaking process and wished that more such proceedings could be as collaborative and participatory as this one.

BALTIMORE SELECTION PROCESS

Weav facilitated a similar first- and final-round selection process. The selection committee was once again composed of NRDC subject matter experts, partners from community organizations not applying for funding, and representatives from the City of Baltimore. After the first round of assessments, score variance was flagged for discussion by the committee. One of the most interesting and important differences between the Denver first-round selection process and the Baltimore process was the score variance between NRDC subject matter experts and the community partners. In the discussion that followed, community partners provided relevant and specific local context and information that had been unknown to the NRDC subject matter experts. After a long and dynamic conversation, the group sent 22 top applications to the final round.

The final round selection committee was composed of one NRDC Food Matters team member and two Baltimore representatives, including a local coordinator who had participated in the first round of scoring. There was less score variance in this round than in the first, and [the group selected 11 organizations](#), 9 to receive \$10,000 in funding and 2 to receive \$5,000 each (per their application request).

LESSONS LEARNED

For readers interested in replicating an equity-centered grant-making process, there are many takeaways and lessons learned from our experiences in Denver and Baltimore.

People want to share and they want to be heard.

Initially, the NRDC Food Matters team was concerned about overburdening food rescue and food scrap recycling organization representatives by asking them to participate in a collaborative design process. To alleviate these concerns, the team worked with Weav to create a timeline and participation expectations that respected our partners' time and effort. Taking into account feedback from the initial landscape assessment roundtables, we scheduled facilitation sessions to be half-day so that participants would not lose an entire workday, and the sessions were held in a comfortable space with nourishing food provided. With this focus on participants' well-being, the team witnessed a remarkably high turnout and continued high energy and enthusiasm throughout the sessions in Denver and Baltimore, quickly dispelling our concerns that participants would not feel the session was worth their time. Moreover, participant feedback from both sessions clearly demonstrated that people were eager to share their thoughts and expertise with grant makers and have their input be considered throughout the grant-making process.

There is more than one way to be an expert.

Grant-making processes in both Denver and Baltimore illuminated the importance of opening space for community expertise. Although NRDC team members possess decades of experience in this area, they reported learning new information and getting fresh ideas from the design session participants in each city. As mentioned above, the community-centered expertise of our local partners in Baltimore provided such meaningful insight that it changed the final scores for several applicants. By broadening the idea of what it means to be an expert, the NRDC Food Matters team was able to see a more complete and robust picture of its work in Denver and Baltimore.

Scoring is imperfect, always.

Creating a fair and equitable scoring rubric and process proved to be one of the team's greatest challenges. The scoring rubric was developed with an eye toward equity and with significant insight from potential applicants. However, the team learned that putting applicants in scoring boxes was complicated, inconsistent, and difficult. This process also showed team biases in ways that could not be fully controlled for through the rubric. It was also challenging to use a framework to score applicants while also incorporating more nuanced information that we gleaned from applications. Moreover, although members of the team found it helpful to have simple and open application questions, groups with more capacity and grant-writing experience still scored higher on the basis of written applications alone. To ensure the greatest fairness to all, the members of each selection committee had to acknowledge the limitations of the scoring rubric and find their own ways to explain the meaning and significance of their scores. In order to approach decision making as holistically and equitably as possible, the selection committee should ideally be composed of people who provide a balance between community knowledge and food waste

subject matter expertise. In the end, each group found that—even if imperfect—the scoring rubric helped to guide their selection conversation. They also found that the local partners on the committee provided the most critical insight into the weight and impact of each applicant's work.

An equity-guided process is an effective way of distributing funds.

Within the short grant period of 9-10 months, local organizations used the funds to achieve amazing results. Across Denver and Baltimore, grantees held more than 18 community events, rescued more than 370,000 pounds of food, served 1,700 new food pantry clients, and installed 26 new community composting units. In the two cities, these grants supported the composting of nearly four million pounds of food scraps. At least one organization used their Food Matters grant to leverage additional funding to support their work. In short, this project achieved what it set out to do: have those closest to the work shape the way it should be done. These grants helped lay a strong foundation for community-led food waste reduction, and we are eager to see how Denver and Baltimore continue to build on that work.

“Funds from the Natural Resources Defense Council supported Cosechando Salud in reaching more people, improving program quality, and solidifying The GrowHaus’s role as a reliable source for healthy food in our community. Given the additional resources allocated to outreach and our mobile delivery program, we saw an uptick in the number of new participants in Cosechando Salud and the Movil program. This impact is exponential, as we expect many first-time families to return to The GrowHaus and refer other families.” — The GrowHaus

BALTIMORE SCORING RUBRIC

INSTRUCTIONS		CRITERIA			LOWEST	MIDDLE	HIGHEST
PRIORITY AREA SCORE WILL ACCOUNT FOR 40% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.		PRIORITY AREA SCORE WILL ACCOUNT FOR 40% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.	SCORES OF 1-3	SCORES OF 4-8	SCORES OF 9-10		
<p>Applicants whose mission and work aligns with at least one of the specific priorities outlined will receive higher scores. Applications aligned with more than one priority will not receive an increased in overall score.</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>	<p>Applicant indicates how their work aligns with the grant opportunity's list of priorities.</p>	<p>Food waste aspect of the organization's work is tangential to its mission. In other words, the primary mission of the Organization/Company/Group is not related to food waste reduction.</p>	<p>Mission or work of Organization/Company/Group is related to reducing or eliminating food waste. Work aligns with the priorities outlined in the grant opportunity.</p>	<p>Mission or work of Organization/Company/Group is related to reducing or eliminating food waste.</p>	<p>Mission or work of Organization/Company/Group is related to reducing or eliminating food waste. Work aligns with the priorities outlined in the grant opportunity.</p>		
<p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>	<p>Applicant demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p>	<p>Applicant is unable to demonstrate expertise or impactful work in this space.</p>	<p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p>	<p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p>	<p>Demonstrates expertise, impactful work in the space and expresses interest in continuing to learn and improve the quality of their work.</p>		
<p>DEMONSTRATED NEED WILL ACCOUNT FOR 30% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>	<p>DEMONSTRATED NEED (30%)</p> <p>Applicant indicates how grant funding will close operational funding gaps or alleviate project-funding needs.</p>	<p>Funding would provide surplus for current funding needs. In other words, there is not an urgent need for funding.</p>	<p>Funding will go towards necessary auxiliary costs, an under-funded program/project, or towards planning a new project. In other words, there is a need for funding, but services would not suffer without it.</p>	<p>Funding will go directly to support an immediate and urgent funding gap for operational costs or under-funded program/project. In other words, there is an urgent need for funding and services or the organization would suffer without it.</p>	<p>Funding will go directly to support an immediate and urgent funding gap for operational costs or under-funded program/project. In other words, there is an urgent need for funding and services or the organization would suffer without it.</p>		
<p>DEI WILL BE AVERAGED BETWEEN THE THREE AREAS AND THE SCORE WILL ACCOUNT FOR 30% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.</p> <p>Adapted from the Office of Sustainability's Guidance for Equitable Implementation</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>	<p>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CENTERED (30%)</p> <p>Actively addresses racial and economic inequity in Baltimore City in any or all of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed project does not generate burdens, either directly or indirectly, to groups whose life outcomes are disproportionately affected by structures in society. Services are accessible to households, organizations, and businesses throughout the community—particularly those organizations run by and for historically under-represented communities. Organization/Company/Group supports historically under-represented communities through workforce development, living wage jobs, small business, and/or contracting opportunities. 	<p>The organization does not generate burdens, either directly or indirectly, to groups whose life outcomes are disproportionately affected by structures in society.</p>	<p>Organization addresses all or most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services are accessible to households, organizations, and businesses throughout the community—particularly those organizations run by and for historically under-represented communities. Organization/Company/Group supports historically under-represented communities through workforce development, living wage jobs, small business, and/or contracting opportunities. Proposed project builds community capacity through an expanded knowledge base, funding, or other resources. 	<p>The organization explicitly names addressing racial and economic inequity in their mission and purpose while addressing all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services are accessible to households, organizations, and businesses throughout the community—particularly those organizations run by and for historically under-represented communities. Organization/Company/Group supports historically under-represented communities through workforce development, living wage jobs, small business, and/or contracting opportunities. Proposed project builds community capacity through an expanded knowledge base, funding, or other resources. 	<p>The organization explicitly names addressing racial and economic inequity in their mission and purpose while addressing all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Services are accessible to households, organizations, and businesses throughout the community—particularly those organizations run by and for historically under-represented communities. Organization/Company/Group supports historically under-represented communities through workforce development, living wage jobs, small business, and/or contracting opportunities. Proposed project builds community capacity through an expanded knowledge base, funding, or other resources. 		
<p>Adapted from NRDC's community engagement continuum.</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>	<p>Community-informed, community-led, or community-owned.</p> <p>Community ownership and representation</p>	<p>[OUTREACH & ENGAGE]</p> <p>Organization/Company/Group collects and integrates client feedback into services, through surveys or other means.</p>	<p>[DEEPER ENGAGEMENT]</p> <p>Organization/Company/Group: Collects and integrates client feedback into services.</p> <p>Regularly engages with community served through activities outside of direct services (e.g. community events and forums).</p>	<p>[INVEST & OWN - COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP]</p> <p>Organization/Company/Group: Designs strategies with the communities that are most affected, drawing from their expertise and lived experience.</p> <p>Staff is representative of the communities most impacted and served by their work.</p> <p>This could look like some of the following things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a client or community-advisory board or mechanism for receiving and integrating client and community perspectives in services. Participation from clients/end-users in applicant's goal setting and meetings, compensating them for their time 	<p>[INVEST & OWN - COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP]</p> <p>Organization/Company/Group: Designs strategies with the communities that are most affected, drawing from their expertise and lived experience.</p> <p>Staff is representative of the communities most impacted and served by their work.</p> <p>This could look like some of the following things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a client or community-advisory board or mechanism for receiving and integrating client and community perspectives in services. Participation from clients/end-users in applicant's goal setting and meetings, compensating them for their time 		

Small businesses only: Will receive a 20% score increase against other small businesses if they meet minority and/or woman-owned business standards.

DENVER SCORING RUBRIC

INSTRUCTIONS		CRITERIA			LOWEST	MIDDLE	HIGHEST
FOCUS AREA SCORE WILL ACCOUNT FOR 40% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.		FOCUS AREAS (40%)	SCORES OF 1-3	SCORES OF 4-8	SCORES OF 9-10		
<p>Applicant would be reviewed against one focus area they closely identify with. The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p> <p>If an applicant identifies with more than one area, they should still be given a score between 1 and 10. Applying across more than one focus area does not increase the overall score or strength of the application.</p>		<p>Food waste prevention—efforts to reduce or eliminate excess food at the source, including improved inventory management, repurposing of surplus, and alternatives to the underlying causes of food going to waste.</p> <p>Food rescue—efforts to maintain or expand donation of nutritious foods, make rescued foods more accessible in the most under-served neighborhoods and to people with disabilities, and strengthen the operational efficiency and responsiveness of the food rescue system.</p> <p>Food scrap recycling—efforts to expand or improve composting and/or anaerobic digestion processing or collection infrastructure, including education and recruitment targeting food scrap generators.</p>	<p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to reducing or eliminating food waste.</p> <p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to maintaining or expanding access of rescued food in the most under-served neighborhoods and to people with disabilities.</p> <p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to expanding and improving composting and/or anaerobic digestion processing or collection infrastructure and/or outreach.</p>	<p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to reducing or eliminating food waste.</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p> <p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to maintaining or expanding access of rescued food in the most under-served neighborhoods and to people with disabilities.</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p> <p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to expanding and improving composting and/or anaerobic digestion processing or collection infrastructure and/or outreach.</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p>	<p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to reducing or eliminating food waste.</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p> <p>Work aligns with the recommendations outlined in the food rescue and recycling/landscape assessments.</p> <p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to maintaining or expanding access of rescued food in the most under-served neighborhoods and to people with disabilities.</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p> <p>Work aligns with the recommendations outlined in the food rescue landscape assessment.</p> <p>Mission or work of organization or partnership is related to expanding and improving composting and/or anaerobic digestion processing or collection infrastructure and/or outreach.</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise or impactful work in the space.</p> <p>Work aligns with the recommendations outlined in the food scrap recycling landscape assessment.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p>	
<p>DEMONSTRATED NEED WILL ACCOUNT FOR 30% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>		<p>DEMONSTRATED NEED (30%)</p> <p>Applicant indicates how grant funding will close operational funding gaps or alleviate project-funding needs.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 1-3</p> <p>Funding would provide surplus for current funding needs. In other words, there is not an urgent need for funding.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 4-8</p> <p>Funding will go towards necessary auxiliary costs, an under-funded program/project, or towards planning a new project. In other words, there is a need for funding, but services would not suffer without it.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p> <p>Funding will go directly to support an immediate and urgent funding gap for operational costs or under-funded program/project. In other words, there is an urgent need for funding and services or the organization would suffer without it.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p>	
<p>DEI WILL BE AVERAGED BETWEEN THE THREE AREAS AND THE SCORE WILL ACCOUNT FOR 30% OF THE APPLICANT'S TOTAL SCORE.</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>		<p>DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CENTERED (30%)</p> <p>Diversity, equity, and inclusion organizational values.</p> <p>Community-informed, community-led, or community-owned.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 1-3</p> <p>Has an equal opportunity employment statement.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 4-8</p> <p>States an intention to hire or currently employs clients/end-users.</p> <p>Has an internal diversity, equity, and inclusion statement.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p> <p>Employs clients and end-users.</p> <p>Has an active and internal diversity, equity, and inclusion initiative.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p>	
<p>Adapted from the community engagement continuum.</p> <p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>		<p>Geographic location and reach</p>	<p>[OUTREACH & ENGAGE]</p> <p>Collects and integrates client feedback into services, through surveys or other means.</p>	<p>[DEEPER ENGAGEMENT]</p> <p>Collects and integrates client feedback into services.</p> <p>Regularly engages with community served through activities outside of direct services (e.g. community events and forums).</p>	<p>[INVEST & OWN - COMMUNITY OWNERSHIP]</p> <p>Co-designs strategies with the communities that are most affected, drawing from their expertise and lived experience.</p> <p>This could look like some of the following things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a client or community-advisory board or mechanism for receiving and integrating client and community perspectives in services. Participation from clients/end-users in applicant's goal setting and meetings, compensating them for their time Is a community cooperative. 	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p>	
<p>The applicant should be given a score between 1 and 10 for this section. The matrix provides context for scoring.</p>		<p>Geographic location and reach</p>	<p>Serves client groups that are uniquely disadvantaged.</p>	<p>Serves residents of Elyria Swansea, Globeville, Montbello, Northeast Park Hill, Sun Valley, Westwood or client groups that are uniquely disadvantaged.</p>	<p>Serves residents of Elyria Swansea, Globeville, Montbello, Northeast Park Hill, Sun Valley, Westwood or client groups that are uniquely disadvantaged.</p>	<p>SCORES OF 9-10</p>	

SMALL BUSINESSES ONLY will receive a 20% score increase if they carry any of the following certifications: Colorado Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, Minority and Women-owned Business Enterprise, Woman-Owned Small Business and/or 8(a) small business