



Self-Assessment Tool for Community Health Organizations

Updated 5/20/25

Description of Work: A tool that can assess the extent of equitable approaches used by community-focused capacity building programs. The tool identifies specific areas where the program can improve to become more equitable and inclusive.

Timing: This tool is designed to be flexible in nature to allow its use before program launch, during program implementation, and/or during program evaluation, and still provide informative assessments.

Development of Tool: In 2021, Hep B United formed a Health Equity Workgroup to focus on equity and inclusivity within Hep B United programs. The Workgroup comprised 10 leaders from diverse backgrounds and expertise and Hepatitis B Foundation staff. Chioma Nnaji, Equity and Engagement Strategist and CEO of Ocha Transformations, facilitated the process with the group.

Over nearly two years, the Workgroup developed a Health Equity assessment tool to evaluate the equitable practices of Hep B United's Capacity Building programs and highlight areas of improvement. The tool was designed with simplicity, flexibility, and equity best practices in mind; and with a focus on qualitative and quantitative assessment. Through these guiding principles, the Workgroup designed a resource that can be used for Hep B United's Capacity Building programs and as well as other community-focused capacity-building programs.

Workgroup Members: We give special thanks to our hard-working Health Equity Workgroup members: Chioma Nnaji (Ocha Transformations), Rensely Alik (Micronesian Education Liver Wellness Program), Augustus Woyah (Maryland Department of Health), Dante Hirata Epstein (#justB Storyteller / Hep Free Hawaii), Tamika Jackson (Harm Reduction Coalition), Jason Crum (#justB Storyteller), Richelle Gaiter (Summit Vista), Boatemaa Ntiri- Reid (NASTAD), Diane Randolph Jones (Commonwealth of Massachusetts), and Thaddeus Pham (Hep Free Hawaii).

This working group was created in part using funds from the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention under award #5NU51PS005196-02.

Step 1: Define Key Terms

For each domain in the tool, define any highlighted key terms based on the program being evaluated. For example, if the term "community" is used, specify whether this refers to racial, ethnic, religious, cultural, or social groups relevant to your program. Open-ended questions are provided for each highlighted key term.

Step 2: Assess Each Attribute within Each Domain

The tool includes multiple domains, each with several attributes (52 total across 11 domains). For each attribute, evaluate the program based on the following stages:

- Accomplished: The program fully meets the attribute.
- Established: The program meets the attribute in most areas but has room for improvement.
- Developing: The program is making progress but needs significant work in this area.
- Undeveloped: The program has not yet addressed this attribute.

Step 3: Provide an Overall Score for Each Domain

After assessing all attributes within a domain, give the domain an overall score using a 9-point rating scale (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor). When scoring, consider the significance of each attribute for the program, giving more weight to critical attributes or glaring gaps. For example, a program designed to develop and distribute in-language materials has created a robust distribution system but lacks any translated materials to distribute may be graded as "poor," even though Attributes of the program within that Domain are Accomplished.

Step 4: Analyze Results for Improvement

After completing the assessment, review which attributes are underdeveloped or need further improvement. Focus on these areas to help the program become more equitable and inclusive.

Example Domain

Domain: Definition of domain.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Attribute #1	Example of being accomplished	Example of being established	Example of developing	Example of being undeveloped
Attribute #2	Example of being accomplished	Example of being established	Example of developing	Example of being undeveloped

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Key term #1:
 - Guidance for determining definition. Examples of definitions.
- Key term #2:
 - Guidance for determining definition. Examples of definitions.

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)

Program:

Domain 1: Leadership Team

Leadership Team: The individuals with authority over a program's staff, facilitators, budget, and decision-making processes.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Does the leadership team of the program have familiarity with the community being served?	The leadership team has extensive familiarity and knowledge of the community being served.	The leadership team has familiarity with the community being served with room for continued growth.	The leadership team has begun to develop familiarity with the community being served.	The leadership team has little to no relevant familiarity with the community being served and is not actively developing any.
Are members of the community part of the leadership team ?	The leadership team entirely consists of members of the community.	The leadership team consists of a majority of the members of the community.	The leadership team has some members of the community, but they do not make up a majority.	The leadership team contains no members of the community.
What health equity training and resources are available and used by the leadership team ?	Health equity training and resources are used by the leadership team.	Some health equity training and resources are available to the leadership team.	Very few or low-quality health equity training and resources are available to the leadership team.	No health equity training and resources are available to or used by the leadership team.
Does the leadership team undergo mandatory, regular equity-focused training?	The leadership team undergoes equity-focused training that is both <u>regular</u> <u>and</u> <u>mandatory</u> .	The leadership team undergoes equity-focused training either regularly <u>or</u> is mandatory but not both.	The leadership team undergoes equity-focused training, but it is not <u>regular</u> <u>or</u> <u>mandatory</u> .	The leadership team does not undergo any equity-focused training.
Does the program actively share decision-making power with [marginalized, minoritized, racialized, excluded] community members?	The leadership team actively shares decision-making power with [marginalized, minoritized, racialized, excluded] community members.	The leadership team shares some decision-making power with [marginalized, minoritized, racialized, excluded] community members.	The leadership team shares little decision-making power with [marginalized, minoritized, racialized, excluded] community members.	The leadership team shares no decision-making power with [marginalized, minoritized, racialized, excluded] community members.
Does the leadership team have a regularly reviewed operations document that includes decision-making processes, roles, and responsibilities?	Operations documents are comprehensive and reviewed by the leadership team regularly.	Operations documents are comprehensive or reviewed by the leadership team regularly but not both.	Operations documents are not comprehensive or reviewed by the leadership team regularly.	The leadership team does not have an operations document.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Leadership team:
 - Who specifically (name or title) are the individuals with authority over this program's staff, facilitators, budget, and implementation decisions (i.e. executive director; program director, etc.)?
- Familiarity:
 - In what ways is the leadership team knowledgeable about the community being served (i.e. lived experience as a member of the community; prior working experience in the community; educated about the community, etc.)?
- Communities:
 - What are the communities this program targets (i.e. African immigrants, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, People who use drugs; federally qualified health center staff; liver specialists, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 2: Staff and Facilitator Team

Staff and Facilitators: Individuals responsible for organizing, coordinating, and implementing the program based on the leadership team's decisions.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Does the staff and facilitator team of the program have familiarity with the community being served?	The staff and facilitator team has extensive familiarity and knowledge of the community being served.	The staff and facilitator team has familiarity with the community being served with room for continued growth.	The staff and facilitator team has begun to develop familiarity with the community being served.	The staff and facilitator team has little to no relevant familiarity with the community being served and is not actively developing any.
Are members of the community part of the staff and facilitator team ?	The staff and facilitator team entirely consists of members of the community.	The staff and facilitator team is made up of a majority of the members of the community.	The staff and facilitator team has some members of the community, but they do not make up a majority.	The staff and facilitator team contains no members of the community.
What health equity training and resources are available to and used by the staff and facilitator team ?	Health equity training and resources are used by the staff and facilitator team.	Some health equity training and resources are available to the staff and facilitator team.	Very few or low-quality health equity training and resources are available to the staff and facilitator team.	No health equity training and resources are available to or used by the staff and facilitator team.
Does the staff and facilitator team undergo mandatory, regular equity-focused training?	The staff and facilitator team undergoes equity-focused training that is both regular <u>and</u> mandatory.	The staff and facilitator team undergoes equity-focused training either regularly <u>or</u> is mandatory but not both.	The staff and facilitator team undergoes equity-focused training, but it is not regular <u>or</u> mandatory.	The staff and facilitator team does not undergo any equity-focused training.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Staff and facilitator team:
 - Who specifically (name or title) are the individuals responsible for organizing, coordinating, and implementing the program? i.e. program manager; outside contractor.
- Familiarity:
 - In what ways is the staff and facilitator team knowledgeable about the community being served? i.e. lived experience as a member of the community; prior working experience in the community; educated about the community, etc.
- Community: defined in Domain 1.

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 3: Materials and Resources - Written and Verbal

Materials and Resources - Written and Verbal: Items used to support the program's goals.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Are materials and resources developed in a way that makes them understandable ?	Materials and resources are developed to be easily understood <u>and</u> are assessed for being easily understood before dissemination.	Materials and resources are developed to be easily understood <u>or</u> materials and resources are assessed as being easily understood before dissemination.	Materials and resources are developed with only some consideration about being easily understood <u>and</u> materials and resources are not assessed before dissemination.	Materials and resources are developed without ease of understanding in mind and materials <u>and</u> resources are not assessed before dissemination.
Are materials and resources collaboratively drafted and/or reviewed by members of the community being served?	All materials and resources are collaboratively drafted <u>and</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.	Some materials and resources are collaboratively drafted <u>and</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.	Some materials and resources are collaboratively drafted <u>and/or</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.	No materials and resources are collaboratively drafted <u>or</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.
Are materials and resources representative of the community being served?	All materials and resources are entirely about the community being served.	Some materials and resources are entirely about the community being served while others are more general.	Some materials and resources include the community being served.	No materials or resources include the community being served.
Are materials and resources being delivered in a way that ensures they reach the intended community ?	Materials and resources are being delivered through methods informed by the targeted community.	Materials and resources are being delivered through general best practices.	Materials and resources are being delivered but without informed decision-making.	Materials and resources are not being delivered or through limited means.
Are materials and resources being delivered in a way that ensures their intended outcome ?	Materials and resources are having their intended outcome.	Materials and resources are having an impact but have not reached the intended outcome.	Materials and resources may or may not be having an impact.	Materials and resources are having no impact.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Materials and resources:
 - What materials and resources are offered by this program (i.e. fact sheets; presentations; websites; videos, etc.)?
- Understandable:
 - In what ways are materials and resources designed to be easily understood (i.e. ensuring language at or below a certain reading level; using plain language best practices; content review by members of the community, etc.)?
- Collaboratively:
 - How did you collaborate with members of the community being served to draft and/or review the program's materials and resources (i.e. focus groups; surveys; interviews, etc.)?
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.
- Representative:
 - In what ways is the community being served represented in the materials and resources of the program (i.e. videos and pictures reflect the community; stats about the community; information impacting that specific community; key messaging developed by community members; cultural competencies considered, etc.)?
- Delivered:
 - In what ways are you getting materials and resources to the community and why were these ways chosen (i.e. mail; email; in-person; web; social media; TV; radio; etc.)?
- Outcome:
 - What is the end goal for your materials and resources (i.e. increase public awareness; inform provider decision making; persuade policy makers, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 4: Accessibility and Recruitment

Accessibility and Recruitment: The extent to which program services are available and easily reached by individuals, including those with diverse abilities, socioeconomic backgrounds, and geographic locations.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Are services being promoted in a way that ensures they reach the intended community ?	Services are promoted through methods informed by the targeted community.	Services are promoted through general best practices.	Services are promoted but without informed decision-making.	Services are not being promoted or through limited means.
Are services being delivered in a way that ensures they reach the intended community ?	Services are being delivered through methods informed by the targeted community.	Services are being delivered through general best practices.	Services are being delivered but without informed decision-making.	Services are not being delivered or through limited means.
Are services being delivered in a way that ensures their intended outcome ?	Services are being delivered and are having their intended outcome.	Services are being delivered and having an impact but have not reached the intended outcome.	Services are being delivered and may or may not be having an impact.	Services are being delivered and are not having an impact or are not being delivered at all.
Are the requirements for members of the community to access program services overly burdensome?	Services are accessible by members of the community with minimal requirements.	Services are accessible by members of the community with some requirements.	Services are accessible by members of the community with significant requirements.	Requirements make services inaccessible to members of the community.
Are the barriers for members of the community to access program services able to be overcome?	Services are accessible by members of the community with minimal barriers.	Services are accessible by members of the community with some barriers.	Services are accessible by members of the community with significant barriers.	Barriers make services inaccessible to members of the community.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Services:
 - What services are offered by this program (i.e. technical assistance; screening services; vaccination services; public health information; research outcomes, etc.)?
- Promoted:
 - In what ways are you advertising program services to the community and why were these ways chosen (i.e. mail; email; in-person; web; social media; TV; radio; etc.)?
- Delivered:
 - In what ways are you getting services to the community and why were these ways chosen (i.e. in-person events; one-on-one coaching; walk-in services; e-visits; etc.)?
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.
- Outcome:
 - What is the end goal for your program's services (i.e. increased public awareness; increased provider education; higher screening rates; higher vaccination rates, etc.)?
- Required:
 - What requirements put in place by the program must be met before services can be accessed by members of the community (i.e. application form; selection committee interview; financial commitment; citizenship; location, etc.)?
- Barriers:
 - What hurdles exist that must be handled before services can be accessed by members of the community (i.e. transportation to a physical location; internet connection; insurance, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 5: Pedagogy

Pedagogy: Strategies, methods, and principles employed in the teaching and education of individuals within the program.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Are the methods used to inform program participants designed in a way that ensures their intended outcome ?	The methods used to inform participants are having their intended outcome.	The methods used to inform participants are having an impact but have not reached the intended outcome.	The methods used to inform participants may or may not be having an impact.	The methods used to inform participants are not having an impact.
Are the methods used to inform program participants drafted and/or reviewed by members of the community being served?	All methods used to inform participants are collaboratively drafted <u>and</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.	Some methods used to inform participants are collaboratively drafted <u>and</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.	Some methods used to inform participants are collaboratively drafted <u>or</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.	The methods used to inform participants are not collaboratively drafted <u>or</u> reviewed by members of the community being served.
Are the methods used developed by or reflective of marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded communities ?	All methods used are developed by or reflective of marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded communities.	Some methods used are developed by or reflective of marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded communities.	Few methods used are developed by or reflective of marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded communities.	The methods used are not developed by or reflective of marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded communities.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Methods:
 - In what ways are you getting information to program participants and why were these ways chosen (i.e. in-person events; classroom style; one-on-one coaching; walk-in services; e-visits; etc.)?
- Program Participants:
 - Who are the individuals taking part in this program?
- Outcome: Defined in Domain 4.
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 6: Feedback From Grantees and Partners

Feedback from Grantees and Partners: Information, opinions, or responses provided by organizations or individuals who have received project services.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Does the program seek feedback from program participants?	Feedback is sought for all steps of the program.	Feedback is sought for some steps of the program.	Feedback is sought only once.	Feedback is not sought.
Does the program ensure that the feedback represents the community being served?	Feedback reflects the community being served.	Feedback comes from the community being served but may be skewed.	Feedback comes from the community being served but is skewed or there is uncertainty.	Feedback from the community is not indicative of the whole community being served.
Does the program ensure that feedback influences future programming in a meaningful way?	Program is built specifically to incorporate feedback in future iterations.	Program is flexible and can incorporate feedback in future iterations.	Program can incorporate feedback in future iterations with some difficulty.	Program is unable or unwilling to incorporate feedback in future iterations.
Are program participants from local or grassroots organizations given equal voice and power as those from larger institutions?	There is equal voice and power given to all participants.	There is a slight imbalance in voice and power among participants.	There is a moderate imbalance in voice and power among participants.	There is a significant imbalance of voice and power based on organization size.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Feedback:
 - In what ways are you getting information from program participants and why were these ways chosen (i.e. post-visit survey; focus groups; hosted office hours; required evaluation; passive info from partners, etc.)?
- Program Participants: Defined in Domain 5
- Represents:
 - In what ways are you ensuring that feedback is coming from a group of program participants that reflect the overall participants of the program (i.e. requesting feedback from specific partners; comparing demographics of feedback givers to community being served, etc.)?
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.
- Influences:
 - In what ways are you ensuring the feedback received is incorporated into the program's future work (i.e. consistent updates to program curricula; flexible programming; new pedagogy methods, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)

Domain 7: Morale, Connectedness, and Culture

Morale, Connectedness, and Culture: Overall mood, motivation, and confidence of individuals; strengths of relationships and collaborations among individuals and organizations involved in the program; shared values, beliefs, and practices within the organization.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Does the program environment ensure a positive experience for participants?	Environment is developed to prioritize a positive experience.	Environment allows for a positive experience.	Environment passively allows for engagement.	Environment does not prioritize or encourage engagement.
Does the program environment encourage participants to engage with each other?	Environment is developed to prioritize engagement.	Environment allows for and encourages engagement.	Environment passively allows for engagement.	Environment does not prioritize or encourage engagement.
Does the program environment encourage lasting connections among participants?	Environment is developed to prioritize lasting connections beyond the program.	Environment encourages lasting connections beyond the program but isn't a priority.	Environment passively allows for lasting connections.	Environment does not prioritize or encourage lasting connections.
Does the program's culture and values align with the community the services are being offered?	Services are provided by members of the community being served.	Services are informed by members of the community being served.	Services are delivered with some consideration for the community being served.	Services are delivered without regard to the specific needs of the community being served.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Positive Experience:
 - How does the environment make participants feel safe, secure, and happy (i.e. comfortable locale; ability to meet other needs, etc.)?
- Engage:
 - How are you facilitating collaboration between participants during the program (i.e. group meetings; partnerships; cohort setting, etc.)?
- Lasting connections:
 - How are you facilitating long-term collaboration between participants so that it may continue following the program (i.e. follow up group meetings; check-ins; cohort meetups; exchanging contact information, etc.)?
- Align:
 - How are you ensuring the program's culture and values are appropriate for the community being served (i.e. professional for providers; silly for children; themed for a specific community; cultural competency, etc.)?
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)

Domain 8: Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring/Evaluation: Systematic processes that assess and track the implementation, progress, and impact of the program.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Is the program being monitored throughout its life cycle ?	The program is monitored during all steps of the program's lifecycle.	The program is monitored during some steps of the program's lifecycle.	The program is monitored once during the program's lifecycle.	The program is not monitored.
Are evaluation methods diverse <u>and</u> participatory?	Evaluation methods are comprehensive <u>and</u> designed to encourage participation.	Evaluation methods are comprehensive <u>or</u> designed to encourage participation.	Evaluation methods are single-faceted <u>and/or</u> passively encourage participation.	Evaluation methods are single-faceted and do not encourage participation.
Does the program ensure that the evaluation represents the community being served?	Evaluation reflects the community being served.	Evaluation comes from the community being served but may be skewed.	Evaluation comes from the community being served but is skewed or there is uncertainty about the feedback.	Evaluation from the community is not indicative of the whole community being served.
Is the program's impact on the community measurable?	Program impact can be easily <u>and</u> accurately determined.	Program impact can be easily <u>or</u> accurately determined.	Program impact cannot be easily <u>and/or</u> accurately determined.	Program impact cannot be determined.
Does the program ensure that evaluation influences future programming in a meaningful way?	Program is built specifically to incorporate evaluations in future iterations.	Program is flexible and can incorporate evaluations in future iterations.	Program can incorporate evaluations in future iterations with some difficulty.	Program is unable or unwilling to incorporate evaluations in future iterations.
Does the program collect and analyze disaggregated data (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, language) to measure gaps and impact?	Evaluation methods are designed to collect and analyze disaggregated data.	Evaluation methods are designed for significant disaggregated data to be collected and analyzed.	Evaluation methods are designed for little disaggregated data to be collected and analyzed.	Evaluation methods do not allow for disaggregated data to be collected and analyzed.
Does the program have a mechanism to report back to community, partners and grantees?	Reporting back to community, partners and grantees is routine and built into the program.	Reporting back to community, partners and grantees is built into the program but may not be routine.	Only some reporting back to community, partners and/or grantees occurs.	No reporting back to community, partners and/or grantees occurs.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Life cycle:
 - What is the beginning and end time frames of the program you are assessing (i.e. one year of an annual program; a specific cohort; a set frame of time for an ongoing project, etc.)?
- Evaluation:
 - In what ways are you getting information from program participants and why were these ways chosen (i.e. post-visit survey; focus groups; hosted office hours; required evaluation; passive info from partners, etc.)?
- Diverse:
 - What different evaluation methods are used and why were these ways chosen (i.e. quantitative counts of people served; qualitative questions; self-assessment of capacity, etc.)?
- Represents: Defined in Domain 6.
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.
- Influences:
 - In what ways are you ensuring the evaluations received is incorporated into the program's future work (i.e. adjusting future measures; flexible programming; new pedagogy methods, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 9: Grantmaking Processes and Protocols

Grantmaking Processes and Protocols: Identifying funding priorities/ creating guidelines, accepting proposals, reviewing applications, making funding decisions, and monitoring grant outcomes.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Are the application requirements for grants achievable?	Grants are accessible with minimal requirements.	Grants are accessible with some requirements.	Grants are accessible with significant requirements.	Requirements make grants inaccessible.
Are the application requirements for grants easily understood?	Requirements are developed to be easily understood <u>and</u> are assessed for being easily understood before dissemination.	Requirements are developed to be easily understood <u>or</u> are assessed as being easily understood before dissemination.	Requirements are developed with only some consideration about being easily understood <u>and</u> are not assessed before dissemination.	Requirements are developed without ease of understanding in mind and materials <u>and</u> are not assessed before dissemination.
Are members of the community part of the decision-making process to award grants?	The decision-making entirely includes members of the community.	The decision-making includes a majority of the members of the community.	The decision-making includes some members of the community, but they do not make up a majority.	The decision-making includes no members of the community.
Do members of the decision-making process to award grants have familiarity with the community being served?	Decision-makers have extensive familiarity and knowledge of the community being served.	Decision-makers have familiarity with the community being served with room for continued growth.	Decision-makers have begun to develop familiarity with the community being served.	Decision-makers have little to no relevant familiarity with the community being served and are not actively developing any.
Are grants being promoted in a way that ensures they reach the intended community ?	Grants are promoted through methods informed by the targeted community.	Grants are promoted through general best practices.	Grants are promoted but without informed decision-making.	Grants are not being promoted or through limited means.
Are the grant fulfillment requirements overly burdensome for the amount being awarded?	Grants can be fulfilled with minimal requirements.	Grants can be fulfilled with some requirements.	Grants can be fulfilled with significant requirements.	Requirements make grants unable to be fulfilled.
Does the application process include equity-related questions for potential grantees?	The application includes a major focus on equity-related questions.	The application includes some focus on equity-related questions.	The application includes little focus on equity-related questions.	The application includes no focus on equity-related questions.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Application Requirements:
 - What requirements put in place by the program must be met by participants before grants can be awarded (i.e. submit application form; selection committee interview; letters of recommendation, etc.)?
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.
- Decision-making process:
 - What process is used to make decisions about grant awards and why was it chosen (i.e. internal decision; mixed review committee; scoring rubric, etc.)?
- Familiarity:
 - In what ways is the grant decision makers knowledgeable about the community being served (i.e. lived experience as a member of the community; prior working experience in the community; educated about the community, etc.)?
- Promoted
 - In what ways are you promoting program grants to the community and why were these ways chosen (i.e. mail; email; in-person; web; social media; TV; radio; etc.)?
- Fulfillment Requirements:
 - What requirements put in place by the program must be met by participants before the end of the grant cycle (i.e. submit reports; check-ins; presentations; publications, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)



Domain 10: Compensation

Compensation: Monetary or non-monetary rewards provided to individuals.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Are program participants adequately compensated for their time and work?	Program participants receive compensation considered adequate by the participants themselves.	Program participants receive compensation considered adequate by the overall community.	Program participants receive compensation, but it is not considered adequate by the community or the participants themselves.	Program participants are not compensated.
Does the program have guidelines for assessing adequate compensation?	Program has specific guidelines it follows to determine compensation.	Program has general guidelines it follows to determine compensation.	Program has few or non-comprehensive guidelines it follows to determine compensation.	Program has no guidelines it follows to determine compensation.
Is there a process in place to gain ongoing feedback on compensation options?	Program is built specifically for ongoing feedback on compensation options.	Program is flexible and can incorporate ongoing feedback on compensation options.	Program can incorporate ongoing feedback on compensation options with some difficulty.	Program is unable or unwilling to incorporate ongoing feedback on compensation options.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Program Participants: Defined in Domain 5.
- Adequate:
 - How is compensation calculated (i.e. formula; a set amount; feedback from community; mirrored a similar org, etc.)?

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)

Domain 11: Resource Allocation

Resource Allocation: How budget decisions are made and resources distributed throughout the program.

Attribute	Accomplished	Established	Developing	Undeveloped
Are members of the staff and facilitator team part of the resource allocation decisions?	Resource allocation decisions are made with the staff and facilitator team fully involved.	Resource allocation decisions are made with only some input from the staff and facilitator team.	Resource allocation decisions are made with consideration to feedback from the staff and facilitator team, but they are not decision-makers.	Resource allocation decisions are made without involving staff and facilitator team.
Are members of the communities being served part of the resource allocation decisions?	Resource allocation decisions are made with the communities being served involved.	Resource allocation decisions are made with only some input from the communities being served.	Resource allocation decisions are made with consideration to feedback from the communities being served, but they are not decision-makers.	Resource allocation decisions are made without involving members of the communities being served.
Are program participants part of the resource allocation decisions?	Resource allocation decisions are made with program participants fully involved.	Resource allocation decisions are made with only some input from program participants.	Resource allocation decisions are made with consideration to feedback from the program participants, but they are not decision-makers.	Resource allocation decisions are made without involving program participants.
Are marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded community members part of the resource allocation decisions?	Resource allocation decisions are made with marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded community members fully involved.	Resource allocation decisions are made with only some input from marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded community members.	Resource allocation decisions are made with consideration to feedback from marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded community members, but they are not decision-makers.	Resource allocation decisions are made without involving marginalized, minoritized, racialized, and/or excluded community members.
Is there a process in place to gain ongoing feedback on resource allocation?	Program is built specifically for ongoing feedback on resource allocation.	Program is flexible and can incorporate ongoing feedback on resource allocation.	Program can incorporate ongoing feedback on resource allocation with some difficulty.	Program is unable or unwilling to incorporate ongoing feedback on resource allocation.

Key terms to define (highlighted above):

- Staff and facilitator team: Defined in Domain 2.
- Community: Defined in Domain 1.
- Program Participants: Defined in Domain 5.

Reviewer Score (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor)