**HAC Projects SELF-ASSESSMENT Rubric**  
(please see rubric below)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Completed by:** |  | **Email address:** |  |
| **For Project #:** |  | | |
| **Project Name:** |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appropriateness** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * The project did not meet some local needs * The project design had to be fully revised at some point during the project * The project deliverables were often not on schedule * The project did not include any local partners | * The project seems to meet some local needs * Elements of the project design had to be revised at some point during the project * The project plan was realistic * The pace of this project was appropriate sometimes, but some deliverables were off schedule * Some background analysis done before the project started on at least one out of three: related research, similar initiatives, and community needs * The project included zero or few local partners | * The project seemed to meet local needs * The project was well designed * The project plan was realistic and addressed some of the needs of the population served * The pace of this project was appropriate most of the time * There was some background analysis done before the project started on at least two out of three: related research, similar initiatives, and community needs | * The project met local needs as confirmed by locals * The project was well designed to fit into the community it served * The project plan was realistic and addressed the full complexities of the population served * The pace of this project was appropriate * The project considered possible risks comprehensively and planned accordingly * There was sufficient background analysis done before the project started on at least two out of three: related research, similar initiatives, and community needs * The project planned to involve local beneficiaries and partners like NGOs, community associations, government, etc. |
| **Appropriateness Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **4** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effectiveness** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * The project met less than ½ of its measurable outcomes as evidenced by collected data, or did not collect data to measure outcomes projected | * The project met ½ of its measurable outcomes as evidenced by collected data | * The project met at least ¾ of its measurable outcomes as evidenced by collected data | * The project met all of its specific, measureable, time sensitive outcomes as evidenced by a mixture of qualitative and quantitative data |
| **Effectiveness Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sustainability** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * The project will not continue without grant funding * The next phase of the project is not clear yet * The risk that the outcomes will not be maintained is high | * The project is not likely to continue without grant funding * The next phase of the project is not clear yet * The risk that the outcomes will not be maintained is medium | * The project will likely continue without grant funding for 1 year * The next phase of the project is planned and realistic * There is someone dedicated to continuing to plan for project sustainability * The risk that the outcomes will not be maintained is low | * The project will likely continue without grant funding for more than 2 years * The next phase of the project is planned and realistic * The project will increase in scale next year * There is someone dedicated to continuing to plan for project sustainability * The risk that the outcomes will not be maintained is low |
| **Sustainability Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * The project leaders are unsure that the project impact has changed the experience of the target population /community for the better, or data shows that it has not. * It is unknown if the people affected by the project would not have access to project benefits otherwise, or it is confirmed that they would through another initiative | * The project leaders think that the project impact has changed the experience of the target population /community f or the better * The project has some unforeseen negative effects on communities, individuals or environments * There is no testing for measurement invariance (subpopulation of the target population that didn’t receive the same level of success as others by gender, ethnicity, or other) * It is unknown if the people affected by the project would not have access to project benefits otherwise | * The impact has changed the experience of the target population /community for the better as evidenced by data * The project has little to no unforeseen negative effects on communities, individuals or  environments * There is little evidence of measurement invariance (subpopulation of the target population that didn’t receive the same level of success as others by gender, ethnicity, or other) * Some of the people affected by the project would not have access to project benefits otherwise | * The impact has significantly changed the daily experience of the target population/community for the better as evidenced by data * The project has no unforeseen negative effects on communities, individuals or environments. * There is no evidence of measurement invariance (subpopulation of the target population that didn’t receive the same level of success as others by gender, ethnicity, or other) * The project affected people who otherwise would not have access to project benefits |
| **Impact Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **4** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficiency** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * The project took too long to meet its goals or did not meet its goals * The project used grant money to fund things that ultimately did not contribute to the project goals being met * Data and information was not collected to inform program changes | * The project felt rushed to meet its goals or took too long to meet its goals * The project could have met its goals in a more cost effective way * Data and information was not collected to inform program changes until the end of the project | * The project met its goals in the an adequate time frame considering the community it served * The project met its goals in a cost effective way possible considering the community it served * The costs involved were reasonable, given the benefits * Informal collection of progress informed project changes that needed to be made to reach goals | * The project met its goals in the fastest way possible considering the community it served * The project met its goals in the most cost effective way possible considering the community it served * The costs involved were reasonable, given the benefits * Real time, formal (standardized) data collection informed project changes that needed to be made to reach goals |
| **Efficiency Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Connectedness** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * This project does not take into account other initiatives happening in the area * This project is not able to connect individuals involved with local resources * This project does not improve any other issues in the area | * This project takes into account some initiatives happening in the area * This project is not able to connect individuals involved with local resources * This project does not improve any other issues in the area | * This project takes into account some other initiatives happening in the area and connects where possible * This project improves at least one other issues in the area * The project is able to connect individuals involved with local resources | * This project takes into account a full scan of other initiatives happening in the area and connects where possible * The project has taken initiative to connect individuals involved with local resources to further develop their assets and strengths * This project improves multiple other issues in the area |
| **Connectedness Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **3** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coverage** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * Other than the project this problem addresses, It is unknown what other problems exist in the community * It is unknown if the project benefits the most vulnerable people in this community | * This project brings a solution to the a problem in this community, but there are many larger problems the members are experiencing * This project does not benefit the most vulnerable people in this community | * This project brings a solution to the one of the most difficult problems this community is facing * This project benefits the most vulnerable people in this community | * This project brings a solution to the most difficult problem this community is facing as evidenced by qualitative or quantitative data * This project benefits the most vulnerable people in this community as evidenced by qualitative or quantitative data |
| **Coverage Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **4** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team** | | | |
| **1 - Needs Improvement** | **2- Fair** | **3- Good** | **4-Excellent** |
| * The members of this project team did not listen to each other with patience and respect. * Decisions were not made communally * Some team members contributed much more than others * Work was disorganized * Project progress was not monitored by shared documents and regular communication | * The members of this project team listened to each other with patience and respect sometimes. * The group split the work without regard for individual’s specific strengths * Decisions were not always made communally * Some team members contributed much more than others * Work was often disorganized * Project progress was not monitored by shared documents and regular communication | * The members of this project team listened to each other with patience and respect most of the time. * The group relied on each individual’s strengths to build the most successful project whole * Decisions were often made communally but there were times everyone’s input wasn't heard * Project progress was monitored by shared documents and regular communication, but there were times where documents were not updated | * The members of this project team always listened to each other with patience and respect. * The group relied on each individual’s strengths to build the most successful project whole * Decisions were always made communally with all members’ input considered * Each team members’ use of time was balanced and fair compared to other group members * Work was shared and organized * Project progress was monitored by shared documents and regular communication |
| **Coverage Score** (whole number only)**:** | | | **4** |

***Thank you for complete this self-assessment.***  
**Please save a copy of this file, renamed with your project number or name, and upload back to your report.**